DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 620 JC 940 317

AUTHOR Klein, Charlie; And Others
TITLE Analysis of Faculty Equivalency Policies.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 68p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Degrees (Academic); Educational Policy; *Employment Qualifications; *Evaluation Criteria; Intellectual Disciplines; Multicampus Districts; *School Policy; State Standards; State Surveys; Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Selection; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Minimum Faculty Qualifications

ABSTRACT

Employment of community college faculty who do not meet California statewide minimum qualifications, but whose qualifications are locally determined to be "equivalent" is authorized by Assembly Bill 1725. The process and criteria to determine equivalency must be agreed upon by the local academic senate and governing board. As of October 1, 1992, 65 districts had adopted equivalency policies. Extreme variation exists as to the length, completeness, and type of these policies. With respect to the process of determining equivalency, 35% of the policies indicate that all equivalency determinations are made by a special committee; 29% indicate that screening committees make determinations which are then reviewed by a special committee; and 23% indicate screening committees make determinations without review. Equivalency determinations are made by 31% of the colleges before initial application screening, while 23% indicate that initial screening occurs first, and equivalency is only determined for candidates chosen for interview. The mean number of members on an equivalency committee is five. Fewer than two-thirds of the policies mention documentation. Among multicampus districts, 48% have policies ensuring districtwide applicability of determinations. As recommended by a 1989 position paper by the statewide Academic Senate, equivalency to a degree requires equivalency to both general education and major coursework, and equivalent experience requires skills mastery and knowledge of the working environment. The Senate also provided a list of "evidence" of equivalency, which appears, often with changes, in more than half of the policies. Twelve policies describe different determination processes for part-time faculty. Sample policies are included. (ECC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 620

Analysis of Faculty Equivalency Policies

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. S. Klein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

December 1992

JC 940 317

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analysis of Faculty Equivalency Policies

December 1992

Human Resources Division
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-3607

This report was prepared by Charlie Klein, Specialist in Minimum Qualifications and Employment Issues, under the direction of Maria C. Sheehan, Ed.D., Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, and Joseph Freitas, Dean of Human Resources.

For additional copies of this report, please contact Judy Frith, Office Assistant, at (916) 445-2392. If you have comments or questions about its contents, please contact Charlie Klein at (916) 445-4236.

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

December, 1992

Analysis of Faculty Equivalency Policies

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Introduction	v
I. Generalizations	
Number and Range of Policies	1
Glendale Community College District	3
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	9
Difficulties of Analysis	10
II. Equivalency Processes	
Locus of Equivalency Determinations	11
Timing of Equivalency Determinations	12
Composition of Committees	12
Vote Required	13
Appeals and Conflict Resolution	13
Documentation of Equivalency Determinations	14
Los Rios Community College District	17
Rio Hondo Community College District	19
Desert Community College District	21
Multi-Campus Uniformity	24
III. Equivalency Criteria	
Influence of Academic Senate and Other Models	24
Approaches to Forming Criteria	27
Departmental Criteria	28

Table of Contents, continued

Introduction to Local Criteria 29

Criteria for Master's Degree Disciplines 30

Criteria for Any Discipline (Master's or Non-Master's) 37

Criteria for Non-Master's Disciplines 39

Eminence 43

IV. Part-Time Faculty Issues

Different Processes for Part-timers 44

Different Criteria for Part-timers 45

Equivalencies for Specific Courses 46

Emergency Equivalencies 48

Faculty Interns 48

Involvement of Full-time Faculty in Part-time Equivalencies 49

V. Other Issues

Equivalencies and Affirmative Action 50

Precedent vs. Case-by-Case 51

Confidentiality 51

Foreign Degrees and Specialized Institutions 52

Local Qualifications Above Statewide Minimums 53

Equivalencies for Holders of Expired Credentials and Persons Who Taught in Minor Fields 54

Misconception About Vocational Instructor Requirements 55

Appendix A: Districts Sorted According to Types of Criteria 57

Appendix B: Statute and Regulation Authorizing Equivalencies 59

Appenidix C: Requirements for the Instructor Credential and the Limited Service Credential 61

ANALYSIS OF FACULTY EQUIVALENCY POLICIES

Human Resources Division
Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
December 1992

Executive Summary

Employment of faculty who do not meet statewide minimum qualifications, but whose qualifications are locally determined to be "equivalent," is authorized by AB 1725. The process and criteria to determine equivalency must be agreed upon by the local academic senate and governing board.

As of October 1, 1992, sixty-five districts had adopted equivalency policies. Extreme variation exists as to the length, completeness, and type of these policies. There is little commonality among districts except for some use of language from a statewide Academic Senate model and from the Butte Community College District policy.

Processes: Thirty-five percent of the policies indicate that all equivalency determinations are made by a special committee. Twenty-nine percent indicate that screening committees make determinations which are then reviewed by a special committee. Twenty-three percent indicate screening committees make determinations without review.

Thirty-one percent require equivalency determinations before initial application screening. Twenty-three percent indicate that initial screening occurs first, and equivalency is only determined for candidates chosen for interview.

The mean number of members on an equivalency committee is five, and most districts that use equivalency committees have one or more administrative appointees on them. Half the policies that mention the vote required specify a unanimous vote; some others require more than a majority. About two-fifths of the policies mention procedures for appeals; these are of many different types.

Fewer than two-thirds of the policies mention documentation; some of these mentions are vague and some imply no reasons for determinations will be stated, which raises concern about compliance with the law. Twenty-three percent require use of a special documentation form; three examples of such forms are reproduced in the report.

Among multi-campus districts, 48 percent have policies ensuring district-wide applicability of determinations; 41 percent have no such provisions and determinations are made by campus.

Criteria: A 1989 position paper by the statewide Academic Senate has been influential in providing equivalency philosophy and a conceptual definition, that equivalency to a degree requires

equivalency to both general education and major coursework, and equivalent experience requires skills mastery and knowledge of the working environment. The Senate also proposed a list of "evidence" equivalency applicants must provide, which appears, often with changes, in more than half of the policies.

Some policies mention no criteria at all, and some mention only the Senate's conceptual defintions. However, 55 percent include specific local criteria, and 14 percent include nonspecific local criteria. Twenty-two percent indicate that departments adopt criteria, and there is reason to think this approach is more widespread than reflected in the policies.

All local criteria set forth in the policies are listed in the report, arranged into the following categories:

Criteria for Master's Degree Disciplines

1. Definitional Criteria for Master's Degree
2. Substitution of Master's Degrees Other Than Those on Disciplines List
3. Definitional Criteria for Bachelor's Degree
4. Bachelor's and Coursework Required
5. Bachelor's and Experience, Teaching, or Expertise Required
6. Less Than Bachelor's Required
7. Criteria for Individual Disciplines
8. Criteria of Indeterminate Meaning

Criteria for Any Discipline (Master's or Non-master's)

Criteria for Non-Master's Disciplines

1. Definitional Criteria for Associate Degree
2. Substitution of Education or Training for Experience
3. Substitution of Experience or Expertise for Associate Degree
4. Other Criteria and Indeterminate Criteria

Twenty policies also explicitly include "eminence" criteria, but there is little uniformity of definition. Some policies use "eminence" in combination with other requirements, rather than as a criterion in itself.

The report includes an appendix that sorts all districts according to the type of equivalency criteria they have adopted.

Part-Time Faculty Issues: Twelve policies describe different determination processes for part-time faculty; in half of these, the determination is made by a single individual rather than the usual committee. A few policies also specify different criteria, and there appear to be several indirect ways different criteria may be applied to part-timers.

Fourteen percent of the policies explicitly authorize

equivalencies for specific courses or groups of courses, similar to the old Limited Service credential issued on the basis of district certification.

Twenty percent of the policies provide for emergency equivalency determinations when necessary; these generally require confirmation within one term by the regular process. Twelve policies also include faculty intern provisions, which may need to be modified to comply with new regulations.

A question of compliance with AB 1725 is raised if a policy provides no role for faculty in approving equivalency for part-time instructors.

Other Issues: Antelope Valley Community College District's is the only policy that explicitly describes a way of using equivalency to advance diversity hiring.

Policies are split as to whether equivalency determinations are precedential or case-by-case. Numerous policies contain confidentiality clauses that may require study in light of court decisions.

Fourteen policies include language on establishing equivalence of foreign degrees or degrees from institutions that are not regionally accredited.

Numerous policies contain provisions for setting local qualifications above the statewide minimums, which may need to be examined for conformity with new regulations. Five policies contain provisions, which raise legal issues, giving automatic equivalencies to holders of expired Limited Service credentials or persons who taught in a minor.

Some policies contain "equivalency criteria" for vocational instructors which are actually more stringent than statewide minimum qualifications, apparently because of misunderstanding about the statewide regulations.

Introduction

The community college reform bill of 1988, AB 1725, eliminated State credentials for community college employment, and established a new system of minimum qualifications. But community college districts are permitted to hire persons who do not meet the statewide minimum qualifications, if they are locally determined to have qualifications that are equivalent. (See Appendix B for the text of the authorizing law.) The process and criteria for determining equivalency must be agreed upon jointly by the district governing board and academic senate.

Because the State does not prescribe what processes and criteria may be used, districts have considerable interest in seeing how other districts are handling their equivalencies. The Chancellor's Office in April 1992 published a "Compilation of District Equivalency Policies," which included the texts of 43 policies. The present report builds upon that compilation by analyzing and comparing the contents of equivalency policies in every district where one has been adopted. The texts used for most policies were those submitted to the Legal Affairs unit, some more than two years ago. In a few cases, revisions have since been made in local policies, but indications are that such revisions have not been major and would not significantly alter the report.

Only the contents of the policies on paper were used to construct the analyses in this document. The Standards and Practices Committee of the Academic Senate is currently undertaking a survey which should render substantial information about actual practices. All personnel officers, instructional administrators, and local academic senate officers are urged to respond fully to the Senate's questionnaire, and to communicate ideas and views about needed changes in equivalency or minimum qualifications regulations to the Chancellor's Office and the Senate. The minimum qualifications system is undergoing review and amendments will be brought to the Board of Governors in 1993.

It is apparent that many local equivalency policies have borrowed some elements, particularly definitions, from past credentials regulations. For comparison, therefore, the texts of repealed regulations defining the requirements for the Instructor and Limited Service credentials are included as Appendix C.

No conclusions or recommendations will be found in this report. Conclusions may suggest themselves to the interested reader. Recommendations should emerge in the course of the overall review of minimum qualifications which will be completed next year.

The Chancellor's Office is occasionally asked about good models for a local equivalency policy. While we do not approve these policies, following are a few districts whose policies illustrate some different major approaches: Allan Hancock, Antelope Valley, Foothill-DeAnza, Glendale, Los Rios, Redwoods, and Santa Monica.

ANALYSIS OF FACULTY EQUIVALENCY POLICIES

I. Generalizations

Number and Range of Policies

As of the end of September 1992, sixty-five districts had adopted equivalency policies. All are included in this analysis. Of the districts that have not formally adopted a policy, none has deliberately chosen not to have an equivalency policy. In every case, the lack of an adopted policy is the result of protracted committee work or governance difficulties, and district personnel indicate that they hope to have a policy in the future. The six districts presently without equivalency policies are:

Compton	Napa Valley
Los Angeles	Palo Verde
Mt. San Jacinto	San Jose-Evergreen

In some of these districts, drafts already exist and formal adoption is expected soon. At Mt. San Jacinto, the personnel officer indicates the college is actually following a draft policy which has not yet been approved by the local senate.

The mere fact that an equivalency policy has been adopted by most districts, however, does not necessarily attest to any great substance in the policy. The length and quality of the policies vary enormously. In a subjective reading of all policies, 18 of them (or 28 percent) might be termed "incomplete," in that they contain very little detail of process and criteria. Twenty-three policies, or 35 percent, might be termed "complete," in that they substantially addressed both process and criteria. Others contained details of process but no details of criteria, or vice versa, and yet others contained confusing or contradictory wording or reflected misconceptions about State law.

As illustrations of the range of these policies, one "complete" policy (Glendale's) and one "incomplete" policy (San Joaquin Delta's) are reproduced on the following pages.

Glendale's policy, like the majority, draws some of its wording from the intent language of AB 1725 and from the statewide Academic Senate's position paper, "Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications" (Fall 1989). The policy includes two unusual features: it establishes a set of "minimum standards for consideration of equivalency" and carefully states that meeting one of these standards does not constitute equivalency, but only establishes the right of an applicant to remain in the screening pool until a later point in the selection process; and it then offers a second list of suggested criteria that the selection committee may use to make the final equivalency determination.

The San Joaquin Delta policy, by contrast, establishes that

equivalency may be considered, and assigns responsibility for convening an equivalency committee. The only further information is the composition of the committee (although not how the faculty members are to be chosen).

GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

POLICY ON EQUIVALENCE TO THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

I. Background

Assembly Bill 1725 provides for the hiring of faculty who do not meet the precise letter of the minimum qualifications, provided that "the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent" (Sec.87359). The criteria and process for reaching this judgment must be determined by the Board of Trustees of Glendale Community College District and the Academic Senate.

Every district will need to have and use an equivalency process. It does not lower standards. The purpose of the process is to make hiring less bureaucratic, less rigid. Applicants who can provide conclusive evidence that they have education or experience at least as good as what is required by the minimum standards deserve careful consideration, even if their degrees have different names or if they acquired their qualifications by a route other than the conventional one. If the equivalency process were not used at all, fully qualified candidates would not receive consideration.

The faculty in the discipline is at the heart of the equivalency process. At Glendale Community College care has been given in establishing equivalent criteria and drafting the supplemental application page to elicit relevant information.

The authority to determine equivalent qualifications does not give authority to waive those standards and accept less qualified individuals. The fact that a particular candidate is the best that the college can find does not affect the question of whether he or she possesses equivalent qualifications. The issue is not how badly an instructor is needed, but whether this person does have qualifications as good as those who do meet the letter of the minimum requirement. Determination of equivalency will be done fairly and expeditiously while maintaining the standards of AB 1725.

II. Philosophy

It is the philosophy of the Glendale Community College district that faculty hiring procedures and guidelines be established that provide for a college faculty of qualified people who are experts in their subject areas, who are skilled in teaching and serving the needs of a varied student population, who can foster overall college effectiveness, and who are sensitive to and themselves represent the racial and cultural diversity of the adult population of the State of California.

The Board of Trustees represented by the administration has the principal legal and public responsibility for ensuring an effective hiring process. The faculty represented by the local Academic Senate has an inherent professional responsibility to ensure the quality of its faculty peers through the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the hiring process.

One part of the process needed to fulfill these responsibilities is a procedure for determining when an applicant for a faculty position, though lacking the exact degree or experience specified in the Glendale Community College Disciplines List, nonetheless does possess qualifications that are at least equivalent.

III. Minimum Standards for Consideration of Equivalency

The college's hiring procedures clearly define when and how these minimum standards are used in the context of the hiring process. They are not used to determine equivalency. They are used to decide whether an applicant who applies based on equivalency shall remain in the pool. The following minimum standards for consideration for equivalency shall apply:

A. In the case of **disciplines normally requiring a master's degree**, the minimum standard for consideration of equivalency shall be:
   - o a BA/BS plus 30 units of coursework from an *accredited institution or
   - o a BA/BS plus appropriate licensure from an accredited institution or
   - o a BA/BS plus certification as an instructor in the discipline or
   - o a BA/BS plus additional coursework and experience

B. In the case of **disciplines not normally requiring a master's degree**, the minimum standard for consideration of equivalency shall be:
   - o a BA/BS or an AA/AS from an accredited institution plus the appropriate number of years of experience in the subject matter area (two years with a BA/BS, six years with an AA/As) or
   - o coursework from an accredited institution (which may have lead, for example, to a Certificate of Completion) plus verifiable expertise in the field.

If these minimum standards are not met, the applicant does not meet the minimum qualifications through equivalency and is omitted from the pool. If these standards are met, it does not necessarily mean that the equivalency is satisfied; the candidate remains in the pool until the determination of equivalency.

IV. Criteria for Equivalency

Candidates who claim equivalent qualifications shall provide conclusive evidence that they possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to those required by the minimum qualifications. The conclusive evidence must be as clear and reliable as the college transcripts being submitted by other candidates. Specifically, the person making the claim must provide conclusive evidence in regard to each of the following:

A. For establishing the **equivalent of a required degree**, possession of at least the equivalent in level of achievement, breadth, and depth of understanding for each of the following criteria:
   1. The general education required for that degree
      AND
   2. The major course work required for that degree.

Examples of **formal academic equivalents to the degree** might include:
For a discipline requiring a MA/MS or BA/BS,
- o the degree requirement with a different name but supported by course work equivalent to that of the field required
- o completion of course work and academic requirements required for the degree without the award of the degree (e.g., a doctoral student advanced to candidacy in a program that did not award a MA/MS, or a candidate who has completed degree requirements but has not received the degree due to the academic calendar

For a discipline requiring a MA/MS,
- o a MA/MS in teaching in the discipline with 18 semester units in the discipline and also a BA/BS in the discipline

For a discipline requiring a BA/BS,
- o at least 120 semester units including general education and 30 units in the discipline, at least 18 of which are upper division or graduate

For a discipline requiring an AA,
- o at least 60 semester units including courses usual to a general education component (toward a Certificate of Completion, for example).

Examples of **non-formal academic equivalents to the degree** might include:

- o substantial work experience equivalent to the degree IF that experience involved research, organization, or other work products AND IF that experience included the quantity and diversity necessary to round out the character of the experience as equivalent to degree work
- o substantial academic experience and accomplishments equivalent to the degree; such as teaching upper division or graduate level courses together with scholarly publications or books
- o substantial artistic experience and/or accomplishments equivalent to the degree; e.g., performances, shows, exhibitions, compositions showing a command of the major or occupation in question
- o clear and verifiable eminence in the appropriate field. Documents must establish that the candidate is recognized as eminent outside of his/her geographical region AND that eminence is based on experience and activities in this field clearly beyond those that are usual.

For the discipline of Dance, an equivalency could be

- o any BA/BS AND
  four or more years of training with recognized dance educators AND
  two or more years professional performance experience AND
  two or more years teaching experience at the community college level or higher.

For a discipline that is a Foreign Language and where the applicant is a native speaker, an equivalency could be

- o any MA/MS AND
  fluency in the language AND
  one of the following:
  two or more years experience working directly with the language (as translator, interpreter, publisher, or editor, for example) OR two or more years teaching at the community college level or higher.

A candidate who does not provide conclusive evidence in regard to both 1 and 2 above does not possess the equivalent of the degree in question.

B. For establishing the equivalent of required experience, possession of thorough and broad skill and knowledge for each of the following criteria:

1. Mastery of the skills of the vocation thorough enough for the specific assignment and broad enough to serve as a basis for teaching the other courses in the discipline

AND

2. Extensive and diverse knowledge of the working environment of the vocation.

Examples of documents in support of relevant experience might include:

- o substantial evidence of work products that show a command of the major in question
- o employer statements or other evidence validating related work experience
- o in case of self-employment, continuity of experience can be shown by presenting copies of relevant tax forms (Schedule C or partnership form) over the number of requested years.

A candidate who does not provide conclusive evidence in regard to both 1 and 2 above does not possess the equivalent of the experience in question.

V. Determination of Equivalency

Initial determination of equivalency shall be made AFTER the selection committee has chosen the applicants that they would like to interview but BEFORE the names of the prospective interviewees proceed to the Personnel Office. No applicant shall receive an interview unless the minimum qualifications or their equivalent are met.

Initial determination of equivalency shall be made by at least three members of the selection committee including the committee chair and the Senate representative. A selection committee may, at its own discretion, meet as a body to consider equivalencies or to challenge the decision of its subcommittee.

VI. Equivalency Committee

If the subcommittee of the selection committee or the selection committee as a whole is unable to agree, a final recommendation shall be made by the Equivalency Committee, a standing committee of the Academic Senate. The Equivalency Committee shall consist of:

Vice President of the Senate
Two Senators
Two members of the Selection Committee
(the committee chair and the Senate representative)

It is desirable that at least one of the members of the Equivalency Committee has had training in affirmative action issues or is a member of a group under-represented on the faculty as a whole. It is also desirable that Equivalency Committee members serve more than one year to insure consistency in the process.

The Equivalency Committee shall meet within 5 working days of receiving a request from the Selection Committee.

The Personnel Officer may be consulted at any time during the determination of equivalency.

In-service training on equivalency procedures shall be available to members of the Academic Senate and to division chairs/deans.

If the Board of Trustees is not in agreement with an equivalency recommendation, the Equivalency Committee shall reconsider the matter. Final decisions by the Board of Trustees as to individual equivalencies shall be in agreement with the recommendation process.

VII. Equivalency Procedures for New Applicants for Contract Positions

It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to apply for equivalency and supply all documents held in evidence before the committees.

Any applicant who has applied under an equivalency and who satisfies the Minimum Standards for Consideration of Equivalency may remain in the eligible pool until the paper-screening is completed and the list of interviewees is compiled. If the committee wishes to include the applicant among the interviewees, the determination of actual equivalency must first be done. If the equivalency is met, the applicant may be interviewed; if the equivalency is not met, the applicant may not be interviewed. Meeting the Minimum Standards for Equivalency allows an applicant to remain in the pool and gives that person "the benefit of the doubt" (as far as meeting the equivalency) until the interview level is reached.

The Academic Senate Equivalency Committee and the Personnel Office will review all requests for equivalency on a regular basis, overseeing the process as it is conducted across campus. All selection committees shall follow the same process and guidelines, thereby insuring consistency. The Personnel

Office shall maintain a database of all equivalency requests and their outcomes, saving a record of past applicants for future positions. All deliberations and all records involved in equivalency proceedings shall be confidential and kept in the Personnel Office with copies sent to the Academic Senate Equivalency Committee and to the Office of Instruction as soon as possible after the determinations are made.

VIII. Equivalency Procedures for Adjunct Applicants or Full-time Faculty Seeking To Serve in an Additional Discipline or Full-time Faculty Seeking To Qualify for Additional Faculty Service Areas

Full-time and adjunct faculty may acquire **new assignments** only if they meet the requirements for that discipline as specified in the **Glendale Community College Disciplines List** (local qualifications), possess qualifications equivalent to these, or possess an appropriate credential. Full-time faculty may add additional **faculty service areas** only if they are **minimally qualified** and meet the requirements for that discipline as specified in the **Minimum Qualifications passed by the Board of Governors**, possess qualifications equivalent to these, or possess an appropriate credential. Those who believe that they meet the qualifications through equivalency shall be subject to the process described above except that the process begins when the faculty member submits the Supplemental Application Form together will all documentation as required of a new applicant.

A committee of at least 3 faculty including the division chair/dean, from the discipline (if not possible, then a related discipline) shall be convened by the division chair/dean after receipt of the application form and evidence. They will review that material and find the faculty member qualified or not qualified to teach in the discipline. Then the Minimum Qualifications Worksheet shall be signed, attached to the application, and submitted to the Personnel Office, which will then notify the faculty member or the Faculty Service Area Committee of the decision.

A determination of equivalency by the committee does not guarantee assignment.

For faculty service area purposes, the equivalency proceedings must be initiated and completed during the Fall semester of an academic year so that the application for the new FSA is completed before February 15th of the same academic year.

IX. Review and Revision

This equivalency policy and its procedures are subject to review and revision at the request of either the Board of Trustees or the Academic Senate. Changes in this policy require the joint agreement of the Board and the Academic Senate. Until there is joint agreement to change it, this policy shall remain in effect.

* College and university degrees and credits submitted for employment, including the equivalency process, or advancement must be from United States institutions accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies recognized by the Council on Post-secondary Accreditation and the United States Secretary of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3004 Equivalency for Applicants

In the event that an applicant for a faculty position wishes to assert an equivalency to the existing requirements of the job description, the applicant may do so by addressing this equivalency in a letter of interest submitted at the time of application.

A. Upon receipt of the request for equivalency the Director of Human Resources will forward the request or requests on a position by position basis to the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President who shall convene an equivalency committee.

B. The committee shall be composed of the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, the Academic Senate President, The Dean of Instruction responsible for the area or the Dean of Student Services, and two faculty members from the discipline or a closely related discipline.

C. Upon the request of the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President this committee shall meet and determine the validity of any claimed equivalencies to the District minimum qualifications.

Adopted 08-20-91

PROCEDURE 3005
MGMT/ACSEN

3005 Additional Equivalencies for Faculty Members

In the event that an existing faculty member wishes to assert equivalency in another discipline or faculty service area the faculty member may do so by addressing the equivalency in a letter of interest submitted to the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President.

A. Upon receipt of the request for equivalency the Assistant superintendent/Vice President shall convene an equivalency committee.

B. The committee shall be composed of the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, the Academic Senate President, the appropriate Dean of Instruction, (or dean of Student Services as appropriate), the Division Chairperson/Director and a faculty member selected from the discipline or a closely related discipline from the indicated faculty service area.

C. Upon the request of the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President this committee shall meet and determine the validity of any claimed equivalencies to the District minimum qualifications.

Adopted 08-20-91

Difficulties of Analysis

For a number of reasons, an analysis of equivalency policies on paper cannot be regarded as a wholly satisfactory review of how the AB 1725 equivalency provision is functioning. Aside from the perennial problem of knowing the extent to which practice matches the words on paper, there are at least two particular difficulties with these policies: ambiguity and omission.

Ambiguity exists, in that an outside reader sometimes cannot tell what is meant by a statement in a policy. Here are some examples of ambiguity or vagueness:

- Long Beach has an Equivalency Committee of eleven members, and its policy defines a quorum as 6 members of a certain distribution. The policy states, "All . . . decisions shall be made by the quorum." Does this simply mean a quorum must be present to take action, but 4 votes could grant equivalency, or does it mean that 6 votes are needed to grant an equivalency?

- Butte's policy (like numerous others) refers to "a BA/BS plus appropriate licensure from an accredited institution." Since government agencies, not accredited institutions, grant licenses, what is meant by this reference?

- College of the Desert's policy states that "Work experience and/or professional licensure will only be considered in special situations where their experience uniquely qualifies an individual to teach a specifically related course." This begs several questions: What portion of the minimum qualifications would work experience and/or licensure substitute for? What are the special situations? How much experience or what type of licensure would be accepted?

Undoubtedly some of these ambiguities could be cleared up by investigation, but as it has not been possible to investigate the intent behind each of the 65 equivalency policies, the written policies had to be taken at their face value, along with their semantic difficulties.

Omission constitutes another type of problem. It is evident, reading the policies, that many of them don't tell the whole story. Some policies don't describe the process for making equivalency judgments; many don't describe (or characterize in only the most general words) the criteria being used; a few tell very little about either process or criteria. Another kind of omission occurs when a policy <u>appears</u> complete, but in fact leaves out important operational information, or is out of date. Sierra College offers an example. This district has developed a process (now being followed by some other districts) that provides the equivalency applicant in a master's-level discipline with details of the courses required for the applicable master's degree in a California university, and then requires the applicant to document

how he possesses the knowledge that would be gained in every one of those courses. This is a complex, demanding, and interesting procedure, but there is no hint of it in the college's written equivalency policy, which uses general, "boilerplate" language to characterize the district's equivalency criteria.

II. Equivalency Processes

Locus of Equivalency Determinations

The greatest number of policies--23 policies or 35 percent*--indicate that all equivalency determinations are made by a special equivalency committee. This committee goes by various names and is variously constituted. It is almost always assigned only this one task, although one or two districts assign equivalencies to a committee that also has other responsibilities. Barstow's policy is unique in requiring all equivalency determinations to be confirmed by the academic senate and the dean of instruction.

The second most popular procedure is to have screening committees make equivalency determinations, which must then be reviewed and approved by a special equivalency committee. This pattern is described in 19 policies, or 29 percent. At some districts, the special equivalency committee only reviews if there is a split of opinion within the selection committee. At Fremont-Newark, the special committee reviews all part-time faculty equivalencies. At El Camino, the special committee reviews if the personnel officer does not agree with a selection committee's equivalency determination.

The San Luis Obispo district uses a variation of the "screening committee-plus equivalency committe" pattern. For an initial, tentative equivalency determination, one member of the standing equivalency commitee participates with the selection committee. Then, after the paper review of applications, if any equivalency candidates are chosen for interview, their applications must go to the full equivalency committee for a determination.

Fourteen policies, or 23 percent, indicate that equivalency determinations are made by selection committees or departments, without any reference to a special committee.

Another "combination" approach is described in four policies (six percent). In this approach, a special equivalency committee reviews "pre-established equivalency criteria," which are submitted by departments, and after these pre-established criteria

---

*Parenthetical percentage references in this report, unless otherwise specified, are based on 65, the total number of district policies included in the analysis.

have been approved, selection committees make equivalency determinations without further reference to a special committee. This is closest to the pattern suggested by the statewide Academic Senate in its Fall 1989 position paper and model.

Finally, the policies of five districts, or eight percent, do not indicate who makes equivalency determinations.

Timing of Equivalency Determinations

More than half of the districts have inserted clauses in their policies regarding when equivalency determinations shall be made. Twenty policies--31 percent--require that equivalency determinations be made for all equivalency applicants, before any further screening takes place. Fifteen policies--23 percent--indicate that initial screening will occur first, and only persons chosen by the selection committee for interview will receive an equivalency determination, which must be done before the interview takes place. (If a district uses a special equivalency committee, this procedure would cut down its workload enormously.)

The Contra Costa district permits selection committees to choose whether they wish to make equivalency determinations before or after initial screening.

The Foothill-DeAnza policy insists that equivalency determinations should be made as late as possible in the process, and is the only policy that requires them to wait until <u>after</u> the first hiring interview.

The language of a few other policies suggests that equivalency determinations will take place simultaneously with initial screening.

Finally, there is a large group of districts for which the timing of these determinations cannot be ascertained from the written policies.

Composition of Committees

Of those districts that use a special equivalency committee, 38 specify the composition and number of members. The number of members on these committees ranges from two (College of the Redwoods) to 14 (Cerritos). The mean number of committee members is five. Faculty members predominate; faculty representation typically includes the president or vice-president of the academic senate, academic senate representatives or appointees, divisional representatives, department chairs, and/or discipline representatives. A number of policies contain a statement, modeled on the statewide Academic Senate's position paper, that the views of discipline representatives are to be given special deference in determining equivalencies.

Twenty-four of these committees (63 percent of districts that use

special committees and specify their composition) also include one or more administrators or administrative appointments. Where an administrative member is specified, the administrators most often specified are the vice president for instruction, the vice president for student services (where appropriate), and a division dean. A few policies make the chief personnel administrator a voting member of the committee; numerous others make the personnel administrator or the affirmative action officer a non-voting, ex officio member. In the San Bernadino district, the personnel officer votes only in case of a tie.

The lowest ratio of faculty to administrative appointments is at Allan Hancock College, where the three-member committee includes one appointment each by the senate president, the vice president for academic affairs, and the vice president for student services. College of the Redwoods and the Chabot-Las Positas district each has a 1:1 ratio of faculty to administrative appointments; but all other districts have a significant preponderance of faculty representatives.

Of the districts that do not specify the composition of the committee, several nevertheless name the committee, and it is often the Academic Senate Equivalency Committee.

Vote Required

Of the districts with a special equivalency committee, 15 mention in their policies the vote required to affirm equivalency. Seven of these specify a unanimous vote, or "consensus." Five policies specify a simple majority vote. San Luis Obispo and Southwestern, each with a five-member committee, specify a supermajority of four out of five. The Cerritos district, with the largest committee at 14 members, requires a majority of those present; since a quorum is defined as eight members present, equivalency may be affirmed by five votes.

Appeals and Conflict Resolution

Twenty-four policies mention appeals or conflict resolution. For seven of these, the process described is simply that disputed cases may be appealed from a selection committee to a special equivalency committee, whose decision is then final. Foothill-DeAnza's policy states that the selection committee may request a second review and consultation with the equivalency committee if not satisfied with the equivalency committee's initial judgment.

Five districts specify that appeals of equivalency determinations may be made to the full academic senate. Generally these policies state that an appeal shall be heard in closed session. Victor Valley's policy permits appeals to the full senate only for complaints that an equivalency has been granted that should not have been granted, rather than for appeals of denial.

Five other district policies allow appeals to both the senate and

an administrator. In two of these districts, the designated administrator is the vice president for instruction; in two others it is the president of the colleges, and in one district it is the president's cabinet.

Four districts give administrators or trustees the sole role of settling disputes or hearing appeals. At College of the Desert, administrative approval must be obtained for all equivalency determinations. At Chabot, tie votes are settled by "the relevant dean." At Cabrillo, appeals may be directed to the college president or his designee. At Merced, appeals may be made to the district governing board, in closed session. (Of course, since the administration and governing board of a district have the legal power of appointment, appeals to them are always implicitly possible; however, only a few policies make this avenue explicit.)

Three districts give the job of hearing appeals to another committee. At the Peralta district, it is the academic senate's Educational Policy Committee. At Sierra, it is an "Equivalency Appeal Board" (whose actions can then be appealed to the district governing board). At Long Beach, it is to a special committee appointed by the senate.

Who may initiate an appeal? Most of the policies do not say, and presumably an appeal could be made by an applicant who has been refused, or by a department member who feels an unjustified equivalency has been granted. A few policies, however, specify that the affirmative action officer or the personnel officer has a special right to bring appeals, and a few others specify that any member of a selection committee may bring an appeal.

Documentation of Equivalency Determinations

The law that authorizes equivalencies, Education Code Section 87359, requires that, when an equivalency hire is made, "The criteria used by the governing board in making the [equivalency] determination shall be reflected in the governing board's action employing the individual." It also mandates that "the written record of the decision . . . shall be available for review." Therefore, written documentation of equivalency determinations is important. Forty-one equivalency policies (63 percent) make some mention of documentation. But most of these mentions--in 26 of the policies or 40 percent--are couched in vague, general terms. For instance, the Coast district's policy states that "A file will be kept in the Personnel Department . . . of those candidates who met the minimum qualifications through the equivalency process."

A few districts--for instance, Hartnell and San Francisco--have adopted language that emphasizes that no details should be provided of the reaons for equivalency judgments:

> "The Equivalency Committee will report its findings to the Personnel Office only in the following form:

1. The applicant meets the minimum qualifications through equivalency; OR
2. The applicant does not meet the minimum qualifications through equivalency."

This language goes contrary to the intent of AB 1725 that a written record be maintained of the rationale behind each equivalency hire.

On the other hand, El Camino's stronger, more specific language is typical of a number of policies in this group: "In all cases in which equivalency is granted [by a selection committee], a report shall be sent to the Equivalency Committee, the Personnel Office, and the Office of the Vice President of Instruction. This report shall include a complete description of the committee's reasons for determining that a candidate has the equivalent qualifications." This language mandates that a complete record be kept for every equivalency; however, some other districts require that a written report be made only when an equivalency applicant is advanced to candidacy or selected for hire.

Fifteen policies (23 percent) require the use of a special documentation form for equivalency determinations. Of these, eleven colleges actually supplied the form with their policies. Three examples of such forms are reproduced on the following pages. They illustrate three different approaches.

The Los Rios form is used by selection committees to certify that a candidate fits into one of a number of quite clearly defined pre-established equivalency categories, with one additional category left open for eminence candidates. For those who meet the pre-established patterns, little narrative explanation is needed, but nevertheless, the form asks for a summary of the equivalency decision. It must be signed by each participating selection committee member.

The Rio Hondo form is used by a special equivalency committee to document its individual, case-by-case decisions. It does not refer to any pre-established categories but simply provides a few lines for the committee to explain why it feels the candidate does or does not have equivalent qualifications. It must be signed by each member of the special equivalency committee.

The College of the Desert form is used on a case-by-case basis, without reference to pre-established criteria, but suggests categories of justification that those completing the form should address. It must be signed by the division chairperson and an appropriate administrator, because at this college all equivalencies are decided by departments and approved by the administration.

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Equivalency Verification
(Policy/Regulation P/R 5121)

Date_____

Applicant_____

College_____

Discipline_____

This form will verify that the candidate for a faculty position in the Los Rios Community College District meets the equivalency for minimum qualifications using the district framework on the reverse of this form.

A. For disciplines requiring the Master's degree (indicate 1 to 5 as stated on the reverse):

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Please summarize equivalency:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. For disciplines not requiring the Master's degree (indicate 1 to 5 as stated on the reverse):

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Please summarize equivalency:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Verification by *Equivalency Committee: For any equivalency, the candidate's own application and transcripts must accompany this form. When other than formal education equivalencies are claimed, more extensive supporting documentation must accompany this form. Include work products, transcripts, statements, or other forms of support.

_____
Faculty Name (typed or printed) Signature Date

_____
Faculty Name (typed or printed) Signature Date

_____
Faculty Name (typed or printed) Signature Date

_____
Area Dean Name (typed or printed) Signature Date

* For the composition and the procedure for the formation of the Equivalency Committee, refer to Los Rios Administrative Regulation R-5121, Sections 8.0 and 9.0.

Form P-38, 7/18/90, Revised: 11/90

STATE-WIDE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

AB 1725 and the Board of Governors have established the following state-wide minimum qualifications:

For subject areas where master's degrees are available, minimum qualifications require a completed master's in the subject area; OR a bachelor's in the subject area PLUS a master's in a related discipline; OR equivalent.

For subject areas where a master's is not expected or available, the minimum requirements are a bachelor's degree in a reasonably related discipline PLUS two years of professional experience PLUS licensure (if available); OR an associate degree in a reasonably related discipline PLUS six years of professional experience PLUS licensure (if available); OR equivalent.

LOS RIOS EQUIVALENCIES TO MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

3.0 Framework for Minimum Qualifications Equivalency Criteria

3.1 Because the State has established two sets of disciplines, one using the master's degree for subject areas where a master's degree is generally available, and one not using the master's degree for disciplines where proficiency is frequently gained outside a degree track, the Los Rios framework for minimum qualifications' equivalency contains two sets of criteria. All degrees and course work must be from colleges/universities accredited by one of the intersegmental accrediting agencies: Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, North Central Associations of Colleges and Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges.

A. For Disciplines Requiring the Master's Degree

1. Master's degree in any discipline, plus course work equivalent to a graduate major in the discipline of the assignment. (30 semester units of graduate and upper division units, of which 15 units must be graduate.)

2. Bachelor's degree in the discipline of the assignment, plus additional post baccalaureate course work equivalent to a graduate major in the discipline of the assignment. (30 units of upper division and graduate units, of which at least 15 units must be graduate.)

3. For the Performing Arts: A bachelor's degree in the discipline plus advanced degree from an institution specific to that art, or four years of professional experience in the discipline.

4. A bachelor's degree in the discipline, plus licensure by an appropriate state agency, plus at least two years of professional experience unless specifically precluded by the adopted list of disciplines.

5. Recognized accomplishments which demonstrate expertise and skill in the field of study beyond that normally achieved through formal education (equivalent to the eminence credential.)

B. For Disciplines Not Requiring the Master's Degree

1. Bachelor's degree in a discipline reasonably related to the discipline of the assignment, plus two years of full-time teaching experience in the discipline of the assignment at an accredited institution, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure, if available.

2. Bachelor's degree in any discipline, plus course work equivalent to a major in the discipline of the assignment, plus two years of occupational experience related to the discipline of the assignment or two years of teaching experience in the discipline of the assignment, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure, if available.[1]

3. Associate degree containing at least 60 units in any discipline, plus graduation from an institution specific to that field, plus two years of professional experience in the discipline, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure, if available.[1]

4. A completed Associate degree containing at least 60 units in any discipline, plus course work equivalent to a major in the discipline of the assignment, plus six years of occupational experience related to the discipline of the assignment or six years of full-time teaching experience in the discipline of the assignment, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure or its equivalent, if available.[1]

5. Recognized accomplishments which demonstrate experience and skill in the field of study beyond that normally achieved through formal education (equivalent to the eminence credential).

---

[1] Teaching and occupational experience may be combined to total the required number of years; all experience must have taken place within the ten years preceding the date of application with at least one year of qualified experience occurring within the three years immediately preceding the date of application.

RIO HONDO COLLEGE

Equivalency Qualifications
Instructional & Student Services Positions

_____, a candidate for the position of

_____, does not meet the minimum qualifications as specified by the Board of Governors.

☐ The candidate has been found to possess the equivalent qualifications, consisting of:

_____

_____

_____

☐ The candidate does not possess the equivalent qualifications

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Division Representatives/Date

_____

Chair-Academic Senate Committee on Equivalency/Date

_____

Academic Senate President/Date

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FACULTY MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS (AB 1725)

NAME_____ SOCIAL SECURITY#_____

DISCIPLINE(S)_____

_____

_____

☐ Minimum Qualifications:. The Applicant named above possesses the minimum qualifications provided for in Education Code Section 87356 and the Board of Governors List of Disciplines for the above discipline. This has been verified by review of the applicant's college transcripts and other application material. The applicant's background is as follows (degrees, experience:)

_____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Credential: The applicant named above possesses a valid California Community College Credential in the following subject area(s)_____

_____

_____

_____

Completed by:_____ _____
Personnel Office Representative Date

****

☐ Equivalency to Minimum Qualifications: The Division Chairperson certifies that the applicant named above possesses the equivalent of the Minimum Qualifications provided for in the Board of Governors List of Disciplines. This determination has been made in accordance with the District's equivalency policies. This equivalency determination is based upon the following applicant information.

Describe in Detail:

☐ Education:

☐ and/or Experience:

☐ and/or Training:

☐ Honors/recognition:

Completed by: _____ _____
Division Chairperson Date

Approved by: _____ _____
(if required by policy) Appropriate Administrator Date

EQUIVALENCY
EVIDENCE VALIDATION

Including, but not limited to (check and describe):

_____ Transcripts w/course descriptions_____

_____ Continuing education_____

_____ Certificates_____

_____ Credentials_____

_____ Licenses_____

_____

_____ Job descriptions_____

_____ Letters of reference_____

_____ Records of performance_____

_____

_____ Publications/reviews_____

_____ Work products_____

_____ Portfolio/exhibitions_____

_____ Consulting_____

_____ Awards/honors_____

_____ Attendance verification_____

_____ Internships_____

_____ Apprenticeships_____

_____

_____ Community service_____

_____ Recognition_____

_____ Other_____

Multi-Campus Uniformity

Policies were analyzed from 17 multi-campus districts. (Two multi-campus districts, Los Angeles and San Jose-Evergreen, are among those that have not yet adopted a policy.) Seven of these (41 percent of the multi-campus policies) indicate that equivalency decisions are campus-based and make no mention of district uniformity. Selection committees make the equivalency determinations at six of these; at State Center, equivalency determinations are made by a special equivalency committee at each college but there is no mention of inter-college uniformity.

Four policies (24 percent of this group) indicate that all equivalency cases go to a district-wide equivalency committee; however, at San Bernadino this is only true for full-time faculty hires and there is no mention of uniformity for part-time equivalency decisions.

In four other districts (24 percent of this group), there are policies which assure that, although individual selection committees make equivalency decisions, district-wide uniformity is maintained. At Grossmont-Cuyamaca and Los Rios this is accomplished by the use of district-wide pre-established equivalency criteria that selection committee must follow. At Foothill-DeAnza and Contra Costa, it is accomplished by explicit policy statements that a candidate found to be equivalent at one college will also be equivalent at the other(s).

The West Valley-Mission district has adopted a unique method for encouraging district uniformity: although equivalency determinations are made by special committees at each separate college, the chair of each such committee serves as a member of the equivalency committee at the other college.

The Yosemite district's policy does not include enough process detail to understand whether equivalency determinations are made on a campus or district basis.

One other district's policy should be mentioned here. College of the Sequoias, while not a multi-campus district, has expressed a unique concern for uniformity. Its policy is the only one submitted that mandates that an applicant who has been judged equivalent at any other California community college shall be accepted as equivalent at College of the Sequoias.

III. Equivalency Criteria

Influence of Academic Senate and Other Models

In the Fall of 1989, the Educational Policies Committee of the statewide Academic Senate published "Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications: A Position Paper and Model." This was well in advance of the July 1, 1990 date for the changeover from

credentials to minimum qualifications. Thus, it was partly the speed with which the Senate acted, as well as the cachet imparted by the document's adoption at the Senate's plenary session, that made this model into the overwhelmingly most prominent influence on the language of local equivalency policies.

The second most marked influence was the Butte policy, apparently because it was among the first to be completed and distributed at a Senate conference. It included a number of procedural details -- confidentiality, conflict of interest prohibition, appeals, reporting of determinations, and so forth -- and included brief lists of specific, college-wide criteria for master's-level disciplines and non-master's disciplines. Its track is more or less plain to see in policies adopted by ten other districts. Two other local policies, Santa Monica's and El Camino's (which itself seems to have borrowed elements from Butte) formed the hubs of smaller clusters. Santa Monica's policy was substantially replicated three other districts, and El Camino's by two. There are lesser examples of exchanging of elements of policy language, or criteria, here and there around the state, but in general, aside from the statewide Senate document and the documents of the districts named above, equivalency policies and criteria seem to have been made from scratch in most districts, and they show great divergencies of approach and of specifics.

The Senate's 1989 paper proposes that "the purpose of the equivalency process is to make our hiring less bureaucratic, less rigid," and suggests that equivalency hires should be made infrequently, even "very rarely." It does not list any specific equivalency criteria, but tentatively suggests that the faculty in each discipline establish the specific criteria, subject to approval by an academic senate committee. It brushes aside the issue of part-time faculty hires, and makes no mention of definitional problems or other questions that arise as districts dispense with the credential rules under which they had operated. Hoever, the model contains certain important elements that have been widely adopted.

Intent of Professional Responsibility.

The Senate's model draws heavily on intent language from Section 4 of AB 1725 for its "philosophy." A key paragraph reflects the ideal of shared governance:

> "The governing board represented by the administration has the principal legal and public responsibility for ensuring an effective hiring process. The faculty represented by the academic senate has an inherent professional responsibility in the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the hiring process which is to ensure the quality of its faculty peers."

Eleven districts have adopted this language into their local

policies. In one case, however, at Chaffey, the language was changed so that faculty act as agents of the governing board, and the professional responsibility is the board's and administration's as well as the faculty's.

Equivalency Is Not Waiver.

The Senate's position paper maintains that the equivalency candidate must be of equal quality to the candidate who meets minimum qualifications squarely:

> "The authority to determine equivalent qualifications does not give the authority to waive those standards and accept less qualified individuals. The fact that a particular candidate is the best that college can find does not affect the question of whether he or she possesses equivalent qualifications. The issue is not how badly an instructor is needed, but whether this person does have qualifications as good as those who do meet the letter of the minimum qualifications."

Thirteen districts have adopted language directly or indirectly reflecting the Senate's view, in the first sentence, that equivalency must not be considered a waiver. (Pasadena declares that equivalency "is not to be viewed as a back door for the marginally qualified.") But only three of these districts have also adopted the Senate's position in the second and third sentences that recruitment difficulty must play no part in equivalency determinations.

Degree and Experience Equivalents.

A basic conceptual dissection of the components of "equivalency" in regard to academic degrees, and in regard to "professional experience" as used in the minimum qualifications, is offered by the Senate model. It has met with widespread acceptance:

> "For establishing the equivalent of a required degree, possession of at least the equivalent in level of achievement and breadth and depth of understanding for each of the following as separate and distinct criteria:
>
> A. The General Education required for that degree; and
>
> B. The major required for that degree . . .
>
> For the equivalent of required experience, possession of thorough and broad skill and knowledge for each of the following as separate and distinct criteria:
>
> A. Mastery of the skills of the vocation thorough enough for the proposed specific assignment and broad enough to serve as a basis for teaching the other courses in the discipline.

B. Extensive and diverse knowledge of the working environment of the vocation."

Twenty-nine policies (45 percent) incorporate this language in whole or part. Two of them, Saddleback's and San Diego's, refer only to the "general education plus major" formula for degree equivalency, and do not include the statement on experience equivalency. At Grossmont-Cuyamaca, the policy language omits the "general education" component for degree equivalency, and stresses knowledge of the "current working environment of the vocation." And at Merced, the language is significantly different: it requires general education and/or major coursework and/or experience.

Evidence of Equivalency.

The most widely adopted provision in the Senate's model is its listing of "conclusive evidence" that a candidate must present to prove he or she has equivalent qualifications:

"Conclusive evidence shall be:

1. A transcript showing that appropriate courses were successfully completed at an accredited college or appropriate foreign institution;
2. Publications that show a command of the major in question, the general education of the candidate, or his or her writing skill;
3. Other work products that show a command of the major or occupation in question."

Thirty-four policies (52 percent) include a list of evidence like this, but most are modified in some way. The predominant modification comes from Butte's policy, which adds "a departmentally administered examiation or an interview of the applicant to determine minimum qualifications in the discipline," and "resume, employer statement, other chronological listing, or evidence of appropriate work experience." San Francisco adds that evidence of "life experience" may be considered. Sequoias lists "a certificate or license" as appropriate evidence. The longest expansion of the list occurs at Merced and Allan Hancock, which indicate that "training, certification, and/or teaching experience" constititute evidence of equivalency, as well as "participation, beyond mere attendance, in colloquia, symposiums, seminars, conferences, concerts, productions, projects, or other evidence of such a nature." Several districts also have adopted language to indicate that the list of evidence is non-exclusive; that types other than those listed may be taken into account.

Approaches to Forming Criteria

Ten districts (15 percent) mention no criteria at all in their policies. Of these, three state or imply that departments or hiring committees are allowed to develop and use their own

criteria. One other, Monterey Peninsula, mentions an "eminence" criterion which is applicable only to part-time faculty (see "Part-Time Issues").

Ten policies (15 percent) mention as criteria only the Academic Senate's formula regarding general education and major coursework for degree equivalence, and skills mastery and knowledge of the working environment for experience equivalency. Of these, three also state or imply the use of departmental criteria.

Forty-five districts have adopted some local statement of criteria beyond or rather than the Senate's formula. Of these, the criteria adopted by nine (14 percent) might be characterized as "nonspecific," in the sense that all the criteria employ language that requires a substantial degree of subjective interpretation to give it meaning. The other 36 districts (55 percent) have adopted one or more "specific" local criteria, in the sense that they can be applied with little subjectivity. Of course, many of those in the "specific" group, in addition to their specific criteria, have also adopted one or more "nonspecific" criteria, either an eminence provision or something else.

A breakdown of the 65 districts with formally adopted policies into the four groupings described above will be found in Appendix A.

Departmental Criteria

Allowing faculty in departments or disciplines to prepare the specific equivalency criteria is the approach that seems to be recommended in the statewide Academic Senate's position paper and model. Fourteen districts (22 percent) incorporate some variation of such an approach in their written policies. Departmental criteria appear in combination with all the basic approaches described in the section above on "Approaches to Forming Criteria."

A few of the policies specify the selection committee for a particular position, rather than the department, as the group that will prepare specific criteria.

Sierra College's policy indicates that the department may determine a proficiency test to be used for ascertaining the equivalent skills of candidates.

In the Santa Clarita district, there is a college-wide list of pre-established equivalency criteria, but departments may choose elements from that list, or choose to use no equivalency criteria at all. The Contra Costa district appears to follow a similar procedure, although the policy is unclear.

Antelope Valley College authorizes departments to specify combinations of non-academic and academic training and experience

that will be considered equivalent, even though such combinations do not meet the district's usual across-the-board equivalency criteria, in instances where the pool of applicants from under-represented groups is inadequate.

There may be additional districts that are using departmentally-established criteria, but whose written policies don't mention the fact. Particularly where districts have adopted their own versions of a "disciplines list" (see "Local Qualifications Above Statewide Minimums"), this may be the case. For instance, the San Francisco district's written policy does not mention departmental criteria, but the district has prepared a "disciplines list" based on the wishes of departmental faculty, which establishes numerous discipline-specific equivalencies, including some that are specific to part-time faculty. The Chancellor's Office has made no effort to gather all departmental criteria and has only seen a few of them adventitiously; however, they will be requested as part of the Academic Senate's survey of equivalency practices.

Introduction to Local Criteria

Following are lists of all the local criteria found in the collected policies. The reader should be aware of a few cautions:

1) It must be emphasized that these are only the criteria captured on paper, and one cannot, therefore, draw from them any firm conclusions about the rigor of equivalency determinations <u>in practice.</u> A district may have adopted loose equivalency criteria to give itself flexibility, yet be conservative in its actual appointments. Another district may have adopted no specific local criteria (thus protecting itself from outside criticism of its policy), and yet be very loose in its individual determinations.

2) It has been necessary in some cases to slightly condense or paraphrase the language of some of the criteria, particularly for the purpose of grouping together criteria from several districts. Modifying words have been dropped off in some cases where they seemed redundant, particularly repetitions of the term "equivalent." An effort has been made to preserve all substantive distinctions; but there may be instances in which some subtlety that has local importance is lost.

3) Numerous criteria refer to "units at the upper division <u>or</u> graduate level." The reader should be conscious that here, as with all either/or choices, the less rigorous alternative is the actual minimum criterion; that is, "units at the upper division or graduate level" does not require any graduate school.

4) Some criteria lack clarity, for instance: Must the degree referred to be in a particular discipline, or may it be in any discipline? Are the units referred to required to be taken over and above the units applied toward the bachelor's degree? Must the coursework referred to be in some particular discipline, and if so, is that the discipline of the assignment or a reasonably

related discipline? In particular, the ambiguity as to whether specified coursework must be in addition to the bachelor's or may be within the bachelor's appears to be endemic in these policies, and some of them seem to contain conflicts about the answer. One of the most widely adopted equivalency criteria, "bachelor's plus 30 units of coursework," contains all of the types of uncertainties listed above.

In an effort to facilitate understanding of these terrifically diverse criteria, they have been roughly grouped under headings.

Criteria for Master's Degree Disciplines

1. Definitional Criteria for Master's Degree.

Coursework acceptable for the specified degree, but candidate has degree with a different name, or degree was not awarded.

Antelope Valley
Desert
Glendale
Palomar
Saddleback
San Mateo
Allan Hancock
Victor Valley

Coursework characteristic of the diversity, breadth, and general education required of master's holder.

Southwestern

Master's in anything and 30 units in the discipline, at least 15 graduate and 15 upper division.

Los Rios

Bachelor's in discipline plus unit/course equivalent to master's in related discipline.

Mt. San Antonio

Master's in related field plus 15 upper division or graduate units in discipline.

Lake Tahoe

Thirty upper division units and 24 graduate units in the discipline. Eminence, or work experience, or licensure may be substituted for half the coursework requirements.

Peralta

2. Substitution of Master's Degrees Other Than Those on Disciplines List.

Master's in teaching the discipline, with 18 units in discipline and bachelor's in discipline.

Glendale

Master's in teaching the discipline.

Barstow
Kern
El Camino

Master's in Education with substantial graduate units in discipline.

Barstow
Gavilan
Kern

Master's in Education with 12 graduate units in the disicipline.

El Camino

Master's in anything plus bachelor's in discipline.

Mt. San Antonio

Master's in anything plus 24 units in disicipline, at least 12 in upper division.

Santa Clarita
Marin
Santa Monica

Master's in anything plus 24 units in discipline, at least 18 in upper division.

Allan Hancock

Master's in anything plus upper division and/or graduate units in the discipline.

Mt. San Antonio

Master's in anything plus two years experience or teaching in discipline.

Santa Clarita
Marin
Allan Hancock
Santa Monica

Related degree not listed on disciplines list.

Ventura

3. Definitional Criteria for Bachelor´s Degree.

For required bachelor's, 24 units of coursework in discipline with 18 of them in upper division. Equivalent courses in other disciplines may be counted.

Antelope Valley
Allan Hancock

For required bachelor's, 120 units including general education and 40 units in the discipline, of which at least 30 in upper division or graduate.

Barstow
Kern

For required bachelor's, 120 units including general education and 40 units in the discipline, of which at least 24 in upper division or graduate.

El Camino

For bachelor's, associate degree plus 64 additional units, at least 40 in upper division.

Shasta

For required bachelor's, 120 units including general education and 30 units in discipline, of which at least 18 in upper division or graduate.

Glendale

For required bachelor's major, 30 units of upper division coursework in the discipline.

Peralta

4. Bachelor´s and Coursework Required.

Bachelor's in the discipline plus 30 units in the discipline, at least 15 graduate and 15 upper division.

Los Rios

Bachelor's and combination of 30 graduate units in Education and the discipline.

Barstow
Kern
El Camino

Bachelor's plus 30 units of coursework.

Butte
Fremont-Newark
Glendale
Pasadena (coursework must be upper division or graduate, and appropriate and relevant)
Redwoods
Sequoias
West Hills
West Valley-Mission
Yuba

Bachelor's in discipline plus 30 units with majority of those units in discipline or related disicpline. Thirty units must include 12 graduate and 12 upper division in discipline.

Hartnell

Bachelor's in discipline plus progress toward a master's

Mt. San Antonio

Bachelor's in related discipline plus 12 upper division or graduate units in discipline.

Lassen

Bachelor's in discipline plus 24 upper division or graduate units in field.

Lake Tahoe

Bachelor's in discipline, plus 12 graduate units in discipline.

Santa Monica

Bachelor's in discipline or related discipline, plus 30 units upper division or graduate coursework in discipline or related discipline.

Contra Costa

5. Bachelor's and Experience, Teaching, or Expertise Required.

Bachelor's in related discipline plus 30 additional units in related discipline plus significant experience in discipline.

Shasta

Bachelor's plus appropriate licensure.

Butte
Fremont-Newark
Glendale
Hartnell
Pasadena
Redwoods
Sequoias
West Hills
West Valley-Mission
Yuba

Bachelor's in reasonably related field plus ceritificate or licensure.

Lassen

Bachelor's plus certification as an instructor in the discipline.

Butte
Fremont-Newark
Glendale
Pasadena
Redwoods
Sequoias
West Hills

Bachelor's plus additional coursework and experience of such eminence in the disicpline that the combination of coursework and experience equals a master's.

Butte
Fremont-Newark
Pasadena
Redwoods
Sequoias
West Hills

Bachelor's in discipline, plus 15 upper division or graduate units in discipline, plus teaching or experience in field

Lake Tahoe

Bachelor's in related discipline, plus 24 upper division or graduate units in discipline, plus three years teaching or experience in field.

Lake Tahoe

Bachelor's in discipline, plus 12 graduate units in discipline plus one year experience or teaching in disicpline.

Santa Clarita

Bachelor's in the discipline, plus licensure by state agency, plus two years professional experience.

Los Rios

Bachelor's plus 12 upper divsion or graduate units and 12 lower division units in discipline, plus teaching experience.

San Bernadino

Bachelor's in discipline, plus five years experience in field.

Gavilan

Bachelor's in anything plus six years experience or teaching in discipline.

Marin
Allan Hancock
Santa Monica

Bachelor's in anything plus five years experience or teaching in the disicipline.

Santa Clarita

Bachelor's plus additional coursework and experience.

Glendale
Mt. San Antonio

Bahcelor's in related discipline, plus two years teaching.

Lassen

Bachelor's in related discipline, plus expertise.

Lassen

Bachelor's in discipline, plus teaching or occupational experience in related discipline.

Mendocino-Lake
Siskiyous

Bachelor's in discipline or related discipline, plus some combination of coursework in discipline or related discipline, and experience in discipline. State or national licensure may be counted.

Contra Costa

6. Less Than Bachelor´s Required.

General education portion of bachelor's (38 units) plus coursework or proficiency examination demonstrating knowledge of discipline.

Sierra
Solano

Twenty-four units of upper division coursework, plus current or recent enrollment in college in the discipline; plus equivalent of general education requirements for bachelor's; plus license or certificate.

Gavilan

Associate in discipline plus six years teaching in field, plus professional certification.

Lake Tahoe

Two years experience in subject area within last ten years.

Hartnell

7. Criteria for Individual Disciplines.

For performing arts: bachelor's in the discipline, plus four years of professional experience in the discipline.

Los Rios

For dance: any bachelors's plus four years experience with dance educators plus two years performance experience plus two years teaching experience at community college or higher level.

Glendale

For foreign language: any master's, plus fluency, plus two years working with language or teaching language at community college or higher level.

Glendale

For counselor: bachelor's plus additional 24 units of graduate or upper division coursework in counsleing, psyuchology, social welfare, or student personnel; or 18 units and 2 years experience.

Marin
Mendocino-Lake
Siskiyous

For pre-collegiate basic skills: bachelor's in related discipline plus K-12 credential plus teaching experience in discipline.

Mendocino-Lake

8. Criteria of Indeterminate Meaning.

Meets MQ's for an allied field, plus 24 units of upper division and graduate work in the discipline.

San Mateo

Appropriate equivalent coursework.

Yosemite

Criteria for Any Discipline (Master's or Non-master's)

Work experience, teaching experience, non-degree oriented training, recognized achievement in subject area.

Southwestern

Equivalence to required degree through necessary coursework.

Ventura

Demonstrated excellence as an instructor, and experience outside classroom.

West Valley-Mission

Bachelor's plus two years experience in subject area.

West Kern

Four years of higher education, plus district certification that applicant has adequate training and experience.

West Kern

Associate degree or 60 units plus four years experience in subject area, plus four units of teacher training.

West Kern

High school diploma or G.E.D. plus six years experience in subject area, plus four units of teacher training.

West Kern

Licensure, credential, years of experience, university units in area, alternate degrees, alternate schools (trade schools), eminence, continuing education units, portfolio.

Rancho Santiago

Substantial high-quality work experience.

Glendale
Palomar

Substantial work experience equivalent to degree; e.g., in computers, engineering, journalism.

Barstow
Kern
El Camino (specifies five years)

Substantial academic experience and/or accomplishments equivalent to degree; e.g., teaching at the upper division or graduate level, scholarly publications.

Barstow
Kern
Glendale
Palomar
El Camino (specifies three years)

Substantial artistic experience and/or accomplishments equivalent to degree; e.g., performances, shows, exhibitions, compositions, books.

Barstow
Glendale
Grossmont-Cuyamaca
Kern
Palomar
El Camino

Degree in related field with equivalent coursework in discipline.

Cabrillo

Coursework plus continuing education units and/or internship for licensure and/or professional experience.

Cabrillo

Work experience indicating equivalent knowledge of the discipline.

Foothill-DeAnza
State Center

Completed coursework in amount and type required in qualifying degree program.

Foothill-DeAnza

Production of tangible products (e.g., published works) indicating equivalent discipline-specific knowledge.

Foothill-DeAnza

Experience, work, independent education, or academic/artistic/vocational products.

Imperial Valley
Kern

By agreement between dean and faculty, a person who does not meet other criteria but is judged qualified to render services.

Lake Tahoe
Mendocino-Lake
Siskiyous

Life experience leading to expertise.

San Francisco

Outstanding professional achievement or substantial training in the discipline.

San Mateo

Criteria for Non-Master's Disciplines

1. Definitional Criteria for Associate Degree.

General education portion of associate degree, plus six years experience.

Contra Costa

Coursework characteristic of the diversity, breadth, and general education of the associate or bachelor's holder.

Southwestern

For associate degree, two years or 60 semester hours *of courseowrk* including the general education component.

Antelope Valley
Barstow*
Glendale
Kern*
Sierra
Allan Hancock
El Camino*
*(*These colleges include reference to "the equivalent as defined in "A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experience in the Armed Services," and "A Guide to Educational Credit for Training Programs," both published by the American Council on Education.)*

Sixty units of appropriate coursework and 6 years experience.

West Valley-Mission

For associate degree, coursework that would satisfy degree requirements.

Butte

For associate degree: pass CLEP exam at 50th percentile level in English, Humanities, Math, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences.

San Diego

2. Substitution of Education, Training or Expertise for Experience.

General education portion of associate degree, plus two years recent experience, plus 24 units of coursework or industry training in discipline or related discipline.

Contra Costa

Bachelor's in discipline.

Gavilan

Associate in discipline or related discipline.

Hartnell

Any bachelor's plus enrollment in master's program in the discipline.

Gavilan

For required experience, appropriate collegiate education or training programs.

Barstow
Kern
El Camino

Associate and 60 additional units, plus two years experience.

West Valey- Mission

Associate degree plus 4 years experience in discipline plus one year specialized training.

Solano

Certification or licensure.

Lassen
Mt. San Antonio

Associate degree in anything plus graduation from an institution specific to the field, plus two years professional experience.

Los Rios

For required experience, documented expertise.

Butte

3. Substitution of Experience or Expertise for Associate Degree.

Postsecondary coursework if deemed appropriate, evidence of writing skills, work history, and certificates of attendance at workshops or seminars, or academic, creative or vocational products.

Yosemite

Thirty units and eight years experience.

Mendocino-Lake

Thirty units, 8 years experience, and 4 units teacher training.

Siskiyous

Industry certification and eight years experience.

Mendocino-Lake

Industry certification, eight years experience, 4 units teacher training.

Siskiyous

Coursework plus expertise of such eminence in discipline as to equal associate degree.

Fremont-Newark
Pasadena
Redwoods
Sequoias

Recognized expertise in field.

Gavilan
Lassen
Yuba ("documented expertise)
Ventura ("demonstrated expertise")

Coursework plus expertise.

Glendale

High school diploma plus college coursework equivalent to a major in disicpline plus 8 years experience or teaching in discipline.

Marin
Santa Monica

For aircraft maintenance, air conditioning, manufacturing technology, and welding: high school diploma and eight years of experience.

Mt. San Antonio

High school diploma plus 10 years experience or teaching in disicpline.

Marin
Santa Monica

License or certificate from the state, and 6 years experience.

West Valley-Mission

4. Other Criteria and Indeterminate Criteria.

Associate degree.

Yuba

Certification or licensure as an instructor in the discipline.

Butte
Allan Hancock

Associate degree plus four years experience in discipline and two years of other work experience.

Solano

Associate in anything plus 5 years experience in discipline, or the number of years of experience determined equivalent to five years of education.

Gavilan

Six years experience within last ten years.

Hartnell

Alternative ways of achieving mastery.

Imperial Valley

Teaching may be substituted for occupational experience in MQ's.

Marin
Solano (only for bachelor's holders)
Allan Hancock
Santa Clarita

Eminence

The concept of eminence was clearly intended by the drafters of the AB 1725 employment reforms to be comprised within the "equivalency" provision. In an article explaining the new system for faculty immediately after passage of the reform bill, Cy Gulassa, chair of the task force which drafted the language, wrote: "If Applicant X does not meet the state minimum standards, but the local hiring commitee believes he has equivalent qualifications--for example, he is a distinguished artist--he can still be hired via a waiver process developed jointly by the senate and local board." ("Pilgrim's Progress: Applicant X's Journey to Tenure Under the New Testament of AB 1725," *FACCC Bulletin*, November 1988.)

Twenty districts (31 percent) explicitly mention eminence in their policies, but there is very little uniformity of definition for

this term.

The now-defunct Eminence credential was governed by the following language in Title 5: "Eminence is defined as superior knowledge and skill . . . in comparison with the generally accepted standard of achievement in the subject field . . . Determination of eminence should be based upon a conviction that the applicant, if measured by recognized authorities in his subject field, would be judged superior." This definition has survived verbatim in only a single local policy, Monterey Peninsula's (yet that policy has other provisions that belie the theoretical definition--see "Equivalencies for Specific Courses"). But the essence of the old regulatory definition--that the candidate should be judged superior by recognized authorities in the subject field--has been retained in various forms by a number of districts. For instance, Foothill-DeAnza's policy refers to "preeminence in the discipline as acknowledged by written statements by experts in the discipline." The language used at Antelope Valley and Glendale reflects the notion that an eminent applicant should have more than a local reputation: "Candidate is recognized as eminent outside his/her geographical region and candidate's eminence is based on experiences and activities clearly beyond those that are usual." The definition that is shared by the most districts (Los Rios, Marin, Santa Monica, and Allan Hancock) stresses superior accomplishments, but does not address from whose point of view the superiority should be judged: "Recognized accomplishments which demonstrate expertise and skill in the field of study beyond that normally achieved through formal education."

Some colleges use the term "eminence" in combination with other requirements, rather than as a criterion in itself. For example, the Butte policy (and those of five districts that have followed its model) establishes, as an equivalency criterion for master's-level disciplines, "a BA/BS plus additional coursework and verifiable experience of such eminence in the discipline that the combination of coursework and experience equals a master's degree in breadth, depth, and rigor." Here eminence seems to mean "high quality." A variation of this exists in a few policies which refer to coursework plus "expertise" of such eminence as to equal a degree. And in the Peralta district, "eminence" or licensure in the discipline may be substituted for half of the graduate units deemed equivalent to a master's degree in the discipline, or half of the upper division units deemed equivalent to a baccalaureate major.

IV. Part-Time Faculty Issues

Different Processes for Part-Time Faculty

Twelve policies explicitly mention some differences of process for part-time faculty (aside from "emergency equivalencies"--see section below). In six of these, the differences are only in timing or the logistics of appointing faculty representatives to

an equivalency committee, and so forth. In the other six, the difference is that the department chair or an administrator makes the equivalency determination for part-time faculty, whereas a committee would make the determination for a full-time position.

In most of these cases, the determination of the department chair or administrator is supposed to be made after consultation with departmental faculty, and/or is subject to review by the regular equivalency committee. However, in the Merced district, the department chair alone makes the determination, and review by the regular equivalency committee only occurs if that body asks for a review. In the San Bernadino district, "the appropriate manager" makes the equivalency determination for part-time faculty, subject to approval by the executive vice-president of the college, but not subject to any faculty review.

Anecdotal and personal experience suggest that there are many more districts where procedural differences exist in making equivalency determinations for part-time faculty, even though the differences are not mentioned in their adopted policies.

Different Criteria for Part-Time Faculty

The primary pattern for criteria that are intended for part-time faculty seems to be the course-specific approach, discussed in the next section. Otherwise, there are vey few policies that explicitly set forth separate criteria for part-time instructors. This may be due in part to the position on this issue maintained by key statewide Academic Senate leaders. There is also language in AB 1725 stating an intent that "the minimum qualifications for all faculty should be the same except where the application of qualifications without differentiation would be clearly unreasonable or impractical."

The Foothill-DeAnza policy states that, "Recognition will be made of the alternative preparation common in vocational areas . . . to allow a more reasonable pool for part-time faculty in vocational areas."

The San Bernadino policy is far more explicit. It includes two equivalency patterns that are applicable only to part-time vocational faculty:

> "(1) High school graduation plus six year of appropropriate occupational experience with experience recency within the last two years, and twelve units of course work in teacher training.
>
> (2) High school graduation or equivalent, plus four years of appropriate occupational experience with experience receny within the last two years, and twenty-four units of appropriate major course studies, and twelve units of course work in teacher training."

In degree of rigor, these criteria could be regarded as somewhere in between the previous standards for the regular Instructor credential in vocational fields, and the Limited Service credential, although they are somewhat different from either. The San Bernadino policy also permits a "provisional equivalency," which is granted one year at a time for up to three years, for a part-time instructor who has not yet completed the units of teacher training.

There are also some examples of districts that have developed indirect ways of establishing different standards for part-time instructors in certain disciplines. For instance, the Lassen district has designated a number of vocational and recreational fields, some of which are disciplines on the statewide disciplines list, and some of which are narrower groups of courses, as "specific skill or activities disciplines," in which only expertise or experience will be considered necessary, and no educational requirement will be imposed. Although the paper policy does not say this criterion is applicable to part-time instructors only, anecdotally it is said that such tactics are devised only to facilitate part-time hires, and that the college would use more rigorous standards for a full-time position. Similarly, the Lake Tahoe, Mendocino-Lake, and Siskiyous districts have what has been characterized as a "best available candidate" criterion, which is said to be used only for part-time hires:

> "If an individual does not meet [any other equivalency criteria], and the full-time instructor(s) in that discipline and the [instructional administrator] agree that the potential faculty member is qualified to render services, then that individual's qualifications will be deemed 'equivalent.'"

There are also "buried" equivalency criteria for part-time instructors in the departmental lists of criteria adopted by some districts. For instance, the San Francisco district's equivalency policy says nothing about different criteria for part-timers, yet the department-by-department "disciplines list" devised in that district provides several examples of different criteria for part-time hires, as well as criteria specific to a course or group of courses narrower than a discipline. The list was evidently drafted in a format that invited departmental faculty to submit separate criteria for full-time and part-time hires, if they so wished. Presumably there is more "buried" part-time differentiation in the lists of other districts that use departmental criteria.

Equivalencies for Specific Courses

There were several ways the old Limited Service credential was issued, but the most commonly used basis for issuance was "district certification." For credentials issued on this basis, the courses or area for which the district certified the applicant could be stated on the credential, without regard to the

established list of 76 subject matters that was used for Instructor credentials and for other Limited Service credentials. (The Limited Service credential obtained on the basis of district certification was also restricted to validity in that district.) As a result of a long history of using these course-specific certifications, some districts seem to want to continue the practice in their equivalency policies. Leaders of the statewide Academic Senate have taken a forceful position against the practice (although there has been no plenary resolution on the matter). The Chancellor's Office Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs has said that it is "still an open question" whether course-specific equivalencies are permissible.

Nine equivalency policies (14 percent) explicitly authorize equivalencies for specific courses or areas narrower than an entire discipline. In addition, the Barstow equivalency certification form includes a "conditional equivalency" certification, the meaning of which is unclear, but which might be a course-specific device. College of the Desert's policy, although ambiguously worded, plainly seems to authorize course-specific equivalencies: "Work experience or licensure will be considered when experience qualifies someone to teach a specific course." Other policies are more direct. For example, the Merced policy allows the equivalency committee to certify that "the candidate meets the minimum qualifications through equivalence for a sub-component of the discipline." The San Luis Obispo policy states that "part-time faculty may be granted 'limited equivalencies' for specific courses." Policies or certification forms in use at Grossmont-Cuyamaca, Marin (which calls it a "limited service equivalency"), Mt. San Antonio, and West Kern are equally blunt. The West Kern policy authorizes this type of equivalency certification only on a one-year-at-a-time basis; however, the certification is indefinitely renewable.

Mendocino-Lake's policy mentions special equivalency for only one area which is not a statewide discipline: pre-collegiate basic skills.

The Monterey Peninsula district appears to be using the term "eminence" to refer to what is actually a course-specific certification for a part-time instructor. The "eminence" certification form used in this district, applicable only to part-time hires, specifies the courses the applicant is judged qualified to teach, and includes a certification by departmental faculty that "a need exists." Although the policy quotes the credential definition of eminence, involving superior knowledge and skill as measured by recognized authorities in the field, it is possible that the controlling standard here is actually the certification of need.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that there are some other districts that are issuing course-specific equivalencies, but it is not apparent from their policies. In addition, there are those districts, such as San Francisco, that may have course-specific

criteria "buried" in a departmental list.

Emergency Equivalencies

Hiring of part-time temporary faculty sometimes occurs at the last minute because of the unanticipated addition of new class sections, or the unexpected death or illness of a regular faculty member, etc. Part-time hiring also sometimes takes place during the summer when faculty representatives may be hard to convene for a regular equivalency committee. Thirteen policies (20 percent) provide an emergency procedure for equivalency consideration in such cases. Generally these provisions allow an emergency equivalency judgment to be made by a department chair or an academic administrator; the regular equivalency process must then be followed as soon as possible, within the first term of the part-timer's assignment. If the emergency judgment is not confirmed, the individual's assignment may not be renewed for subsequent terms.

There are a few variations on this procedure, as to who makes the emergency determination. At Palomar, emergency equivalencies are determined only by the chair of the equivalency committee. In the San Luis Obispo district, they may be made by a dean, a vice-president, or any member of the equivalency committee. At Southwestern, they are made by the superintendent/president.

There are also variations in the confirmation process. The Sonoma district's policy provides that the confirming decision is made by the equivalency committee chair alone, unless the hiring committee requests a full equivalency committee review. The Ventura district's policy provides that an emergency equivalency can be granted by whoever is in charge of a hiring decision, and that departmental faculty therafter have five days to challenge it. If no challenge is brought within five days, an emergency equivalency determination becomes permanent.

The Merced policy provides that, if a person hired on an emergency equivalency determination is denied confirmation of equivalency, it permits teaching experience gained duirng the one-semester emergency assignment to be considered later if the person reapplies for another equivalency determination.

Faculty Interns

Under the credentials systems, any district could hire a graduate student who was within two years of completing his program, or a vocational instructor who did not yet have the teacher training required for the regular credential, by having the applicant obtain a "Partial Fulfillment" credential.

Twelve district equivalency policies include provisions giving some similar authority under the minimum qualifications system. However, only one of them makes any reference to vocational instructors. Marin's policy provides for the part-time employment

of a graduate student or an individual to teach a vocational field with at least a high school diploma and five years of experience. Marin's policy is also the only one that specifically requires supervision of such persons, thus bringing it into line with recent faculty intern regulations.

Most of the intern provisions seem to be modeled on the Butte policy, which in turn makes reference to a section of AB 1725 encouraging community colleges to employ CSU and UC graduate students in part-time temporary teaching positions. Unfortunately, the Butte policy incorporated an ambiguity from the legislative language, by saying that part-time teaching positions may be held by:

> "1. advanced graduate students with prior proven teaching experience.
>
> 2. advanced graduate students teaching in areas consistent with the subject area of their graduate program."

The policies of some districts specify that the intern must meet conditions 1 and 2; others say 1 or 2. And others do not try to resolve the ambiguity in the language. College of the Sequoias specifies that the intern, more than being just "advanced," must be in the final semester of his graduate program. By contrast, the Santa Clarita and Marin policies require the graduate student to have completed only 12 units.

Intern provisions at Imperial Valley and Mt. San Antonio seem to derive nothing from Section 66 of AB 1725. Imperial Valley's policy simply says that graduate students may be hired for part-time positions; the Mt. San Antonio policy establishes a bachelor's in the discipline plus progress toward a master's degree as an equivalency criterion.

In light of the adoption, by the Board of Governors, of Sections 53500-502 of Title 5, in January 1992, the faculty intern provisions in these equivalency policies may have to be modified. Those regulations require substantial mentoring of a graduate student employed as a faculty intern. They also resolve the definition of "advanced" by requiring the intern to be at least one-half of the way through his graduate coursework. However, they make no mention of interns in vocational subject areas.

Involvement of Full-Time Faculty in Part-Time Equivalencies

There are a number of districts whose policies or whose equivalency documentation forms indicate that no faculty representative is involved in certifying the equivalency of part-time hires. In these districts, the judgment and certification are done by the department chair or by an academic administrator.

Such a practice might create a question about the locus of

responsibility in terms of the legal authorization for equivalency hires. (See Appendix B.) The law requires not only that equivalency processes and criteria be agreed upon by the governing board and the academic senate, but also that "the agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that <u>each individual faculty</u> . . . possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications" (emphasis added).

If the department chair is a faculty member and a member of the academic senate, it seems a "reasonable procedure" for the senate to choose to assign its reviewing responsibility exclusively to that member. However, a more problematic situation is created if the sole determiner of part-time equivalencies is an administrator and not a member of the senate. While a local academic senate, for whatever reasons, may have agreed to such a procedure, it cannot thereby absolve itself of the responsibility intended by AB 1725, that faculty, acting through the senate, monitor the quality of all equivalency hires.

V. <u>Other Issues</u>

Equivalencies and Affirmative Action

There is little about the interaction of equivalency and affirmative action in these policies. The noteworthy exception is Antelope Valley, whose policy provides that, in general, only "formal academic training equivalent to the training stipulated in the minimum qualifications will be considered acceptable," except after a position has been announced using the established criteria, and the applicant pool has proven inadequate (i.e., unrepresentative). In that case, "the faculty and immediate supervisor in the division may determine that a combination of non-academic and academic training and experience will be accepted as equivalent to the minimum qualifications." The policy specifies that, in such cases, a bachelor's shall be required, plus specific experience judged to indicate equivalency. Equivalency criteria established in this way are subject to review by the senate, the academic vice-president, and the affirmative action officer, and such criteria "sunset" automatically in three years unless there is another demonstrated recruitment problem.

This policy, with its explicit use of equivalency to bolster affirmative action, is unique. A few other districts include less specific provisions aimed toward affirmative action; for instance, the Imperial Valley policy states that "the equivalency process will assist the college in achieving its affirmative action goals," and College of the Sequoias and Monterey Peninsula both give special powers of appeal to the affirmative action officer on behalf of an equivalency applicant who's been turned down. In a few other cases, elements in the equivalency policy appear to be derived from the rules of procedural fairness built into

affirmative action hiring procedures: the North Orange policy requires that names and identifying information be removed from materials that go to the equivalency committee; the Peralta policy provides that each equivalency committee member shall make an independent judgment before they come together to confer.

The statewide Academic Senate's model recommends that each college's equivalency committee include "one member who is also a member of the senate's affirmative action committee or has the approval of that committee as to his or her training and sensitivity to affirmative action issues." No count was taken, but it does not appear this advice has been widely followed.

Precedent Vs. Case-by-Case

The statewide Academic Senate's 1989 position paper and model advised that consistency should be sought as to the equivalency requirements imposed by different academic departments, and the equivalency processes followed by different selection committees, but said nothing about consistency from one candidate to the next. However, some districts seem to perceive an inherent need for consistency based on precedent in equivalency determinations; the policies of 13 districts (20 percent) contain some statement indicating that determinations are seen as precedential. None of these is a hard-and-fast rule; typically they require that an attempt be made to follow precedent to the extent feasible. Either the equivalency committee, or the dean, or the department chair, or the personnel office, is charged with maintaining a list of all past equivalency determinations which shall be used as precedents.

On the other hand, the Butte policy, which has had a considerable impact, includes a provision that, "The granting of equivalency is on a case-be-case basis and does not set precedence for future hires." Ten policies (15 percent) include this language or something like it.

A few districts, such as Solano, El Camino, and San Francisco, have hedged their bets by including statements that determinations are case-by-case <u>and</u> provisions calling for uniformity.

The question as to what extent precedent is binding, is also created by some policies, such as Glendale's and Cabrillo's, that include a specific list of equivalency criteria but do not say (as does, for instance, the Los Rios policy) that a person who meets one of the criteria <u>shall</u> be considered equivalent; rather they say a person who fits one of the criteria <u>may</u> be considered for equivalency.

Confidentiality

Fourteen policies (22 percent) require that equivalency proceedings be kept confidential. The Butte policy, typical of most of these, states: "All deliberations of the departmental

hiring committee and/or the Equivalency Committee and all records involved in the proceedings shall be confidential."

In recent years, there have been court decisions weakening the ability of universities to keep records of tenure proceedings confidential when a claim of unfair treatment is levied. In light of such rulings, the legal underpinnings of confidentiality in equivalency proceedings may need some research.

The policy of College of the Redwoods states that not only deliberations and records, but also equivalency reports shall be kept confidential. In light of the Education Code requirement that the criteria used in making each equivalency determination be included by the governing board in its action employing the individual, it is hard to understand the validity of keeping reports confidential. Such a provision would also make it impossible to judge whether or not precedent had been followed.

Foreign Degrees and Specialized Institutions

The statewide minimum qualifications refer to a degree "from an accredited institution, or equivalent foreign degree," but do not specify the meaning of "accredited" or how foreign degrees are to be verified as equivalent.

Fourteen districts have adopted some policy statement regarding these matters. In ten of these (15 percent), the language is identical:

> "All degrees and credits not covered by the six regional accrediting agencies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the United States Department of Education, including foreign degrees and credits, are subject to verification through the equivalency process. The candidate bears the responsibility of documenting equivalency to accredited United States institutions."

This language seems to leave open the possibility that the district could require an applicant with a foreign degree to submit an evaluation of his educational records by one of the specialized commercial firms that perform such evaluations, but would not necessarily require this of every foreign degree-holder. Language at four other districts contains a similar implication but does not say that the verification of foreign degrees is a matter for "the equivalency process."

There is also a question concerning the acceptability of degrees or credits obtained at U.S. institutions that have specialized, rather than regional accreditation; for example, professional schools of law, psychology, business, or health sciences which are not attached to a regionally-accredited university, or institutions accredited by the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools. Since there is presently no statewide

definition of "accredited" for minimum qualifications purposes, some districts may feel that they need to require an equivalency determination for each applicant with such credits.

Local Qualifications Above Statewide Minimums

Equivalency policies of 14 districts (22 percent) state or imply that the district routinely sets local faculty qualifications above the statewide minimum qualifications. In such a case, the equivalency determination is made in relation not to the statewide requirements, but to the local requirements.

The emphatic language of the Chabot-Las Positas policy is illustrative of this group:

> "Board of Governors List of Allied Disciplines: This list identifies allied fields which the BOG will accept as preparation for given academic fields; the BOG identifies these as "equivalents." However, the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District policy does NOT require that screening committees accept these lists. District screening committees may exceed these standards."

This policy goes on to give an example wherein an applicant for a position teaching history is excluded, even though he has a bachelor's in history and a Master's degree in sociology (apparently an error for "social science," since sociology has never been listed as a reasonably related master's for history), because his Master's degree does not meet local qualifications. However, the policy notes, the applicant could be admitted to the pool if he is judged to have academic preparation equal to that of a Master's degree in history.

The Chabot-Las Positas example raises some puzzling questions. The faculty minimum qualifications were the product of consensus and were originally set by legislation for the entire community college system. They include two patterns in academic fields: a Master's in the discipline, or a bachelor's in the discipline and a Master's in a reasonably related discipline. Is it acceptable for a district to choose to eliminate the second pattern altogether by refusing to admit applicants with degrees in reasonably related fields? And, having done so, is it then acceptable for a district to use the equivalency process to take <u>one</u> such application while excluding others?

A number of districts set their own qualifications by adopting a "disciplines list" locally, specially constructed for that district. If a district wishes to adhere to the statewide standards, a local disciplines list can simply serve as a device for matching up local department and program names with the disciplines headings on the statewide list; but if a district wishes to assert its autonomy in matters of hiring, such a list can readily be used (for example) to tighten the MQ's for

mathematics by eliminating any "reasonably related Master's," to change the MQ's for art by adding additional "reasonably related Master's," to loosen the MQ's for Business by adding a pattern that substitutes professional experience for a Master's, and to differentiate full-time and part-time MQ's in certain health sciences. In effect, the statwide minimum qualifications become nothing more than a starting guideline. The "City College of San Francisco Minimum Qualifications" is an example of a district disciplines list that assumes considerable autonomy to set local standards that are higher, lower, or different.

Almost all of the policies included in this analysis were adopted before the new affirmative action regulations were promulgated in January, 1992. Those regulations include, in Section 53023, new steps that a district must take to justify local qualifications above the statewide minimums, if those lcoal qualifications cause an impact on applicants from underrepresented groups. Some districts may need to adjust the language of their equivalency policies to accommodate the new requirements of law.

Equivalencies for Holders of Expired Credentials and Persons Who Taught in Minor Fields

Five policies (eight percent) provide that holders of expired Limited Service credentials who taught in the district prior to July 1, 1990, or persons who were assigned to teach courses in their minor (in the language of the Riverside policy, faculty who had an "atypical" teaching assignment), are automatically deemed "equivalent."

These provisions raise legal questions. It could be argued that the grandfathering of credentials has been pre-empted by the Legislature in Education Code Section 87355. That section provides that credentials continue to be valid <u>until they expire.</u> Clearly the Legislature could have grandfathered expiring Limited Service credentials and did not do so; therefore it could be viewed as contradictory to the statutory grandfathering rule to use equivalency to establish a local grandfathering rule. Furthermore, the statute provides that credentials continue to be valid <u>under their terms of issuance;</u> for Limited Service credentials, these included a restriction against teaching more than a 40 percent load. When an automatic equivalency is granted, that restriction disappears.

As to equivalency for persons who taught in a minor, it has been disseminated as the opinion of the Chancellor's Office that the authorization to teach in a minor under an Instructor credential continues in force, but so does the requirement for annual reconsideration. An automatic equivalency eliminates annual reconsideration, and thus, again, alters the "terms of issuance" and conflicts with statutory grandfathering.

Misconception About Vocational Instructor Requirements

For disciplines in which the Master's degree is not generally expected or available, numerous equivalency policies describe "equivalencies" which are actually more rigorous than the statewide minimum qualifications themselves.

This apparently comes about because districts have followed the literal language of the minimum qualifications regulations, which requires that the bachelor's or associate degree held by a vocational instructor be "in a discipline reasonably related to the faculty member's assignment." This language appeared in AB 1725 and was carried over into Title 5, but its force has been negated by the non-master's disciplines list. That list, on the recommendation of the Academic Senate, is prefaced by the statement: "Any bachelor's degree or associate degree is considered to be reasonably related to the disciplines on this list for purposes of minimum qualifications."

The language of the minimum qualifications regulation should probably be changed to make it clear that any major is acceptable for vocational faculty's degrees. Until such an amendment is made, districts that have been using a more restrictive policy may wish to re-examine it.

APPENDIX A: DISTRICTS SORTED ACCORDING TO TYPES OF CRITERIA

No Criteria Mentioned

Cerritos
Coast
Feather River
Long Beach
MiraCosta
Monterey Peninsula*
Rio Hondo
Riverside
San Joaquin Delta
Santa Barbara

*(*has an "eminence" criterion for part-time faculty)*

Academic Senate Guidelines Only*

Chabot-Las Positas
Chaffey
Citrus
Desert
Grossmont-Cuyamaca
Merced *(significantly alters Academic Senate wording)*
North Orange
San Luis Obispo
Sonoma County
Victor Valley

*(*equivalent of general education and major coursework for degree; skills mastery and knowledge of working environment for experience)*

Specific Local Criteria

Allan Hancock
Antelope Valley
Barstow
Butte
Cabrillo
Contra Costa
El Camino
Fremont-Newark
Gavilan
Glendale
Hartnell
Kern
Lake Tahoe
Lassen
Los Rios
Marin
Mendocino-Lake
Mt. San Antonio
Pasadena Area
Peralta
Redwoods
San Bernadino
San Diego
Santa Clarita
Santa Monica
Sequoias
Shasta
Sierra
Siskiyou
Solano
Southwestern
West Hills
West Kern
West Valley-Mission
Yosemite
Yuba

Districts Sorted According to Types of Criteria, continued

Nonspecific Local Criteria

Foothill-DeAnza
Imperial
Palomar
Rancho Santiago
Saddleback
San Francisco
San Mateo
State Center
Ventura

No Policy Adopted 10/1/92

Compton
Los Angeles
Mt. San Jacinto
Napa Valley
Palo Verde
San Jose-Evergreen

Departmental Criteria (overlaps other categories)*

Antelope Valley
Cerritos
Chaffey
Desert
Coast
Contra Costa
Hartnell
Lassen
Long Beach
Mt. San Antonio
Rancho Santiago
Santa Clarita
Sierra
Victor Valley

*(*includes only districts that state in their policies they use departmental criteria. Others may also have such a practice.)*

APPENDIX B: STATUTE AND REGULATION AUTHORIZING EQUIVALENCIES

Education Code Section 87359

§ 87359. (Operation contingent) Regulations authorizing local governing boards to employ personnel not meeting minimum qualifications

The board of governors shall adopt regulations setting forth a process authorizing local governing boards to employ faculty members, instructional administrators, and student services administrators who do not meet the applicable minimum qualifications specified in the regulations adopted by the board pursuant to Section 87356. Unless and until amended pursuant to the process described in Section 87357, the regulations shall require all of the following:

(a) No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty member, instructional administrator, or student services administrator under the authority granted by the regulations unless the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications specified in regulations of the board adopted pursuant to Section 87356. The criteria used by the governing board in making the determination shall be reflected in the governing board's action employing the individual.

(b) The process, as well as criteria and standards by which the governing board reaches its determinations, shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board. The agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications specified in regulations adopted by the board of governors. The process shall further require that the governing board provide the academic senate with an opportunity to present its views to the governing board before the board makes a determination; and that the written record of the decision, including the views of the academic senate, shall be available for review pursuant to Section 87358.

(c) Until a joint agreement is reached and approved pursuant to subdivision (b), the district process in existence on January 1, 1989, shall remain in effect.

Added Stats 1988 ch 973 sec 28.

Editor's Notes—For legislative findings and declarations, including operation contingency, see 1988 Note following § 66701.

Section 53430, Title 5, California Code of Regulations

§ 53430. Equivalencies.

(a) No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty member, or educational administrator, or administrator unless the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications specified in this article or elsewhere in this division. The criteria used by the governing board in making the determination shall be reflected in the governing board's action employing the individual.

(b) The process, as well as criteria and standards by which the governing board reaches its determinations regarding faculty, shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board. The agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgement of the academic senate to determine that each individual faculty employed under the authority granted by this section possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications specified in this article.

(c) The process shall further require that the governing board provide the academic senate with an opportunity to present its views to the governing board before it makes a determination; and that the written record of the decision including the views of the academic senate, shall be available for review pursuant to Education Code Section 87358.

(d) Until a joint agreement is reached and approved pursuant to subdivision (b), the district process in existence on January 1, 1989, shall remain in effect.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66700, 70901 and 87359, Education Code. Reference: Section 87359, Education Code.

HISTORY

1. New section filed 6-5-90 by the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges, with the Secretary of State; operative 7-5-90. Submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Education Code section 70901.5(b) (Register 90, No. 37).

2. Amendment of subsections (a) and (b) filed 10-25-91; operative 11-24-91 (Register 92, No. 9).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C: REGULATIONS ON INSTRUCTOR CREDENTIAL AND LIMITED SERVICE CREDENTIAL

Article 3. Community Colleges Instructor Credential

Subarticle 1. General Provisions and Subject Matter Areas

§ 52060. Services Authorized.

This credential authorizes the holder to:

(a) Instruct any course in a subject matter area which appears on the credential document.

(b) Instruct any course in classes for adults.

(c) Instruct any course in a subject matter area in which the holder has completed a minor, if the governing board of the district employing the holder specifically authorizes the holder to teach such courses by resolution. This authorization may be renewed annually by resolution of the governing board.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87277 and 87295, Education Code.

§ 52061. Subject Matter Areas.

The following classifications of knowledge and skills are the subject matter areas recognized for the purposes of credentials issued pursuant to the provisions of this chapter:

(1) Accounting.
(2) Aeronautics.
(3) Agricultural Services and Processing.
(4) Aircraft.
(5) Animal Production.
(5.5) Anthropology.
(6) Architectural, Engineering and Related Technologies.
(7) Architecture.
(8) Art and Design, including Photography.
(9) Astronomy and Astral Physics.
(10) Banking and Finance.
(11) Basic Education.
(12) Biological Sciences.
(13) Botanical Sciences.
(14) Building, Construction and Related Technologies.
(15) A Building Trade.
(16) Business and Industrial Management.
(17) Chemistry.
(18) Communication Services and Related Technologies, including Printing.
(19) Computer Science.
(20) Computer and Related Technologies.
(21) Consumer and Family Education.
(22) Cosmetology and Barbering.
(22.5) Court Reporting.
(23) Decorative Arts and Related Technologies.
(23.5) Dance.
(23.7) Driving Instruction.
(24) Earth Sciences, including Geography, Geology and Geophysics.
(25) Ecology.
(26) Economics.
(27) Engineering.
(28) Ethnic Studies.
(29) Fine and Applied Arts and Related Technologies.
(30) Fire Science.
(31) Foods, Food Services and Related Technologies.
(32) A Foreign Language, Ancient or Modern.
(33) Forestry, Natural Resources and Related Technologies.
(34) Government (Theory and Practice, Local and International).
(35) Health and Physical Care Services and Related Technologies.
(36) History.
(36.5) Humanities.
(36.7) Industrial Arts.
(37) Industrial, Machine and Related Technologies.
(38) An Industrial Trade.
(39) Insurance.
(40) Language Arts and Literature.
(41) Law.
(42) Library Science.
(43) Marine and Related Technologies.
(44) Marine Sciences.
(45) Marketing and Distribution.
(46) Mathematics.
(46.5) Military Science.
(47) Mining, Metallurgy and Related Technologies.
(48) Motel and Hotel Services and Related Technologies.
(49) Music.
(49.5) Nursery School and Pre-School Education.
(50) Ornamental Horticulture.
(51) Nursing.
(52) Office Services and Related Technologies.
(53) Personal Services.
(54) Philosophy and Religion.
(55) Physical Education.
(56) Physics.
(57) Plant Production.
(58) Police Science.
(59) Professional Education.
(60) Psychology.
(61) Public Services and Administration.
(62) Real Estate.
(63) Social Science.
(63.5) Sociology.
(63.7) Special Education (Handicapped).
(64) Textiles, Textile Services and Related Technologies.
(65) Theater Arts and Related Technologies.
(66) Zoological Sciences.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

§ 52062. New Subject Matter Areas.

From time to time the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges may establish new subject matter areas, each of which shall be brought to the board for inclusion in Section 52061 at the first regular meeting of the board occurring after the Chancellor has acted.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 71091, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

§ 52063. Subject Matter Areas (Master's Degree).

A person who is eligible for this credential on the basis of satisfying the requirements in Section 52080(a), (b) and (c) may qualify in the following subject matter areas:

(a) Each subject matter area in which such person can establish the successful completion of 12 semester units in an accredited institution of higher education in upper division courses and 12 semester units of graduate level courses in such an institution; or their foreign equivalent.

(b) Each subject matter area in which such person can establish at least a minor and two years of related occupational experience.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

§ 52064. Subject Matter Areas (Baccalaureate Degrees).

A person who is eligible for this credential on the basis of satisfying the requirements of Section 52080(d) may qualify in the subject matter area in which such person can establish two years of occupational experience, and a major or minor in a subject matter area related to this occupational experience.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

§ 52065. Subject Matter Areas (Associate Degree and High School Diploma).

A person who is eligible for this credential on the basis of the requirements of Section 52080(e) or (f) is qualified in the subject matter areas in which such person can establish occupational experience for the number of years which would qualify such person for this credential.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

§ 52066. Basis for Determination.

In determining the subject matter areas of competence, the courses completed and the occupational experiences undergone by the person shall be considered in the light of their apparent basic content and principles rather than in the light of the application to which they were put or the curriculum within which they fell when completed. A particular course or occupational experience may fall within more than one subject matter area.

In determining whether the requisite number of semester units in a subject matter area has been satisfied, only the semester units for courses which are reasonably related to each other shall be considered. For the purposes of this section, "reasonably related" means that the courses provided unified training and knowledge in a single recognized field or skill.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

§ 52067. Removal of Subject Matter Areas.

A subject matter area shall be removed from a credential if the holder returns the credential to the office of the Chancellor with a written request to remove the subject matter area. If the holder is employed at a community college the holder shall inform the superintendent of his or her employing district of this act in writing. The removal is effective only when the Chancellor receives this written notification. The Chancellor shall return the credential to the holder with the subject matter area removed.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71020 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Section 87227, Education Code.

§ 52068. Addition of Subject Matter Areas.

A holder may file an application with the Chancellor to add one or more subject matter areas to holder's credential. The application shall comply with the provisions of Section 52031. The application shall be investigated and granted or denied. The holder shall be notified of the Chancellor's decision. A new credential will be issued if the applicant is eligible.

The application shall be accompanied by a fee of thirty dollars ($30).

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71020 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87227, 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

§ 52069. Listing of Subject Matter Areas.

All subject matter areas for which a person has applied and is qualified shall be listed on the credential document or in notices sent pursuant to the provisions of Section 52068 and attached thereto.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71020 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87227, 87275 and 87277, Education Code.

Subarticle 2. Basis for Issuance

§ 52080. Instructor's Credential.

To qualify for the instructor's credential the applicant must meet the requirements of one of the subsections of this section:

(a) Master's Degree.

The applicant holds a master's degree, or its foreign equivalent, in a subject matter area other than professional education.

(b) Special Master's Degree in Education.

The applicant holds a master's degree in education for which the applicant successfully completed 12 semester units in an accredited institution of higher education in upper division courses and 12 semester units of graduate level courses in such an institution in a subject matter area other than professional education.

(c) Master's Degree Equivalent.

The applicant holds a degree from or has completed a course of instruction in an accredited institution of higher education, or their foreign equivalents, which the Chancellor finds to be equivalent to a master's degree in a subject matter area other than professional education.

The intent of this section is to make several classes of persons eligible for this credential, including, but not limited to, (1) persons holding degrees in special fields which required higher education in excess of 120 semester units but are not master's degrees, (2) persons who are actively participating and have completed one year of course work in a program of instruction leading to a doctorate degree which omits or permits the omission of the master's degree, (3) persons who obtained their doctorate degree without receiving a master's degree, and (4) persons who have completed all phases of a program leading to a doctorate degree except for the dissertation without receiving a master's degree.

(d) Baccalaureate Degree.

The applicant satisfies all of the following:

(1) The applicant holds a baccalaureate degree, or its foreign equivalent, with at least a minor in a subject matter area related to the occupational experience claimed in satisfaction of the requirement of subdivision (b) of this section.

(2) The applicant has had two years of occupational experience in a subject matter area.

(3) If not included in previous higher education in an accredited institution of higher education, the applicant has received credit for six semester units in a combination of one or more of the following fields, with emphasis upon the subject matter area in which the applicant will teach as it pertains to community colleges:

(A) Principles, practice, scope, and function of education.

(B) Methods and materials, curriculum development, and evaluation.

(C) The learning process and individual differences, behavioral characteristics of youth, race and ethnic relations in schools.

(D) Teaching in the subject matter area in which the applicant will teach, which shall be supervised by an accredited institution of higher education and class work in connection therewith as assigned by the institution. Student teaching approved by the institution may be substituted for this teaching.

(e) Associate Degree or Equivalent.

The applicant satisfies all of the following requirements:

(1) The applicant holds an associate degree or has completed 60 semester units of higher education as a part of an organized educational program, or a foreign equivalent of either.

(2) The applicant has had four years of occupational experience in a subject matter area.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(3) If not included within previous higher education in an accredited institution of higher education, the applicant has received credit for 12 semester units in a combination of one or more of the following fields, with emphasis upon the subject matter area in which the applicant will teach as it pertains to Community Colleges.

(A) Principle, practices, scope, and functions of education.

(B) Materials and methods of instruction, curriculum development and evaluation.

(C) The learning process and individual differences, behavioral characteristics of youth, race and ethnic relations in schools.

(D) Teaching in the subject matter area in which the applicant will teach, which shall be supervised by an accredited institution of higher education and class work in connection therewith as assigned by the institution. Student teaching approved by the institution may be substituted for this teaching.

(4) The applicant has received credit for 6 semester units in any field from an accredited institution of higher education, in addition to the degree or 60 semester units and the 12 semester units required by subdivision (c).

(f) High School Diploma.

The applicant satisfies all of the following requirements:

(1) The applicant holds a high school diploma, its foreign equivalent, or a diploma based upon the General Education Development examination.

(2) The applicant has had six years of occupational experience in a subject matter area.

(3) The applicant has received credit for 12 semester units from an accredited institution of higher education in one or more of the following fields, with emphasis upon the subject matter area or areas in which the applicant will teach, as it pertains to community colleges:

(A) Principles, practices, scope, and functions of education.

(B) Materials and methods of instruction, and curriculum development and evaluation.

(C) The learning process and individual differences, behavioral characteristics of youth, race and ethnic relations in schools.

(D) Teaching in the subject matter area or areas in which the applicant will teach, which shall be supervised by an accredited institution of higher education and class work in connection therewith as assigned by the institution. Student teaching approved by the institution may be substituted for this teaching.

(E) The applicant has received credit for 12 semester units from an accredited institution of higher education in any field, in addition to the 12 semester units required by subdivision (c).

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068 and 87274, Education Code. Reference: Section 87275, Education Code.

Article 12. Community College Limited Service Credential

Subarticle 1. General Provisions

§ 52250. Service Authorized.

This credential authorizes the holder to teach in the manner prescribed by the provisions of Section 52060, if the holder qualified for this credential pursuant to the provisions of Section 52255(a), (b), (d), or (e) of this subchapter. This credential shall authorize the holder to instruct courses in the subject matter areas for which the district certified training and experience in a community college maintained by the district which made the certification, if the holder qualified for this credential pursuant to the provisions of Section 52255(c) of this subchapter.

In either case, the holder shall not teach any number of credit hours which is in excess of 40 percent of the credit hours considered to be a full-time assignment of an instructor in the community colleges in the district by which the holder is employed.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068, 87274 and 87292, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87277 and 87292, Education Code.

§ 52251. Credential Document.

If the applicant qualifies for this credential pursuant to the provisions of Section 52255(c) the document for this credential shall state the subject matter area for which the holder was certified and the district by which he was certified.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068, 87274 and 87292, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87227 and 87292, Education Code.

§ 52252. Duration.

This credential shall be valid for two years and may be renewed for two year terms.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068, 87274 and 87292, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87227 and 87292, Education Code.

HISTORY

1. New section filed 7-15-83; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 83, No. 29).

§ 52253. Life Credential.

The limited service credential may be renewed valid for life upon application and verification that the holder has taught at least one course in the subject area named on the credential in each of three different semesters, quarters, or terms within a two-year period.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068, 87274 and 87292, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87227 and 87292, Education Code.

HISTORY

1. New section filed 7-15-83; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 83, No. 29).

Subarticle 2. Basis of Issuance

§ 52255. Community College Limited Service Credential.

To qualify for the Limited Service Credential the applicant must meet the requirements of one of the subsections of this section:

(a) The applicant satisfies the requirements of Section 52080.

(b) Baccalaureate Degree. The applicant satisfies both of the following requirements:

(1) The applicant holds a baccalaureate degree, or its foreign equivalent with at least a minor in a subject matter area related to the occupational experience claimed in satisfaction of the requirement of subdivision (b) of this section.

(2) The applicant has completed two years of occupational experience in a subject matter area.

(c) Higher Education. The applicant satisfies both of the following:

(1) The applicant has successfully completed four years of higher education, or its foreign equivalent, with a major in a subject matter area.

(2) The district, which maintains the community college which will employ the applicant, certified that the applicant has adequate training and experience to teach classes in that subject matter area.

(d) Associate Degree. The applicant satisfies all of the following requirements:

(1) The applicant holds an associate degree or the completion of 60 semester units in an institution of higher education as a part of an organized educational program, or its foreign equivalent.

(2) The applicant has completed four years of occupational experience in a subject matter area.

(3) The applicant has successfully completed 60 clock hours or 4 semester units of instruction in an accredited institution of higher education in materials, methods, and evaluation.

(e) High School. The applicant satisfied all of the following requirements:

(1) The applicant holds a high school diploma or evidence of successful completion of secondary education, or its foreign equivalent.

(2) The applicant has had six years of occupational experience in a subject matter area.

(3) The applicant has successfully completed 60 clock hours or 4 semester units of instruction in an accredited institution of higher education in materials methods and evaluation.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 71068, 87274 and 87292, Education Code. Reference: Sections 87275 and 87292, Education Code.